Towards a new paradigm of pastoral theology in the social context of Japan

Nakamura, Andrew K.

ABSTRACT

TOWARDS A NEW PARADIGM OF PASTORAL THEOLOGY
IN THE SOCIAL CONTEXT OF JAPAN

Andrew K. Nakamura

This thesis, by investigating modern pastoral theologies in the United States and the United Kingdom, explores a new perspective of pastoral theology in Japan.

American pastoral theology developed in the direction of the Clinical Pastoral Education movement, which was largely informed by psychology and psychotherapy. British pastoral theology was also influenced by these disciplines, but it stressed a different direction, the corporate and social dimension of pastoral care. However, at a broad level of generalization, both American and British pastoral theologies, especially after the 1980s, have gradually shifted the emphasis of their framework to a common attempt to integrate pastoral care and social commitment. By comparison with these Western experiences, much pastoral ministry in Japan has exhibited a strong tendency to neglect the external influences on human beings. It needs a new paradigm of pastoral theology which is socio-politically aware and committed pastoral care. Therefore we discover a remarkable convergence between the Western and Japanese contexts and tasks of pastoral theology.

In chapter 1, we investigate the Japanese Church in history and society, examining the major characteristics of Japanese Christianity and the problems and tasks of pastoral theology. In chapter 2, we examine how modern pastoral theology in the United States has developed, notably the Clinical Pastoral Education movement. However, the impact of the black civil rights movement has brought new directions to modern pastoral theology in the social context of the pursuit of racial justice. In chapter 3, we identify the different development of British pastoral theology, focusing on some representative achievements: the Clinical Theology by Frank Lake and the theology of salvation and healing by Robert Lambourne. We inquire into the shift from a personal-individualistic approach to a communal, corporate and social awareness in pastoral theology. We then turn back to the social context of Japan in chapter 4. Our investigation examines the Emperor (Tenno) system which has definitely formed the ethos of modern Japanese society. We trace the historical process of the establishment and expansion of the modern Tenno system up to the end of the Second World War, and then the dismantlement of the absolute Tenno system and introduction of the symbolic Tenno system. However, surprisingly, there is a persistent pressure by the power elite for reviving the Tenno system of prewar times. In the final chapter 5, we conclude with the case for a new paradigm of pastoral theology in Japan. Various aspects of Japanese culture and society still lie under the Tenno system, therefore the tasks of pastoral care in the Japanese social context should be focused on transforming petrified Japanese culture and society.

TOWARDS A NEW PARADIGM OF PASTORAL THEOLOGY IN THE SOCIAL CONTEXT OF JAPAN

ANDREW KUNISUKE NAKAMURA

A Thesis Submitted in Fulfilment of the Requirements for the Degree of Master of Arts, in the University of Durham, the Department of Theology April 2001

Copyright

Declaration

I confirm that no part of the material offered has previously been submitted by me for a degree in this or any other university.

Signed Andrew K. Nakamura
Andrew K. Nakamura

Date: 10th April 2001

TOWARDS A NEW PARADIGM OF PASTORAL THEOLOGY IN THE SOCIAL CONTEXT OF JAPAN

CHAPTER 5 TOWARDS A NEW PARADIGM OF PASTORAL THEOLOGY IN JAPAN: NEW PERSPECTIVES ON PASTORAL THEOLOGY

INTRODUCTION

There are two main lines of investigation pursued through this study. One is an examination of modern pastoral theology in Western experience, that is, in the United States and the United Kingdom. The other is an exploration of Japanese pastoral theology based on the analysis of the social context of Japanese society. In particular, if Japanese pastoral care is to gain a new perspective, it is essential to take into account the Japanese social context. In doing this, it is inevitable that we examine the Tenno system, because it has been functioning as the most powerful resource of a covert system of control over the Japanese social ethos, norms and prestige in modern Japanese history.

Hence, the main aim of this thesis is to find a new direction of pastoral theology in Japan. To put it more directly, it is to try to integrate pastoral care and social commitment; namely, a 'socio-politically aware and committed pastoral care (Stephen Pattison)' or a 'holistic pastoral care' in the Japanese context. Needless to say, there is enormous discussion about this issue in recent years, that both the individual aspect and the wider social context in pastoral care should not be divided from each other, but continuously kept in an integrated perspective.

At this point, there is a personal reason in my mind why I am so much interested in this study. Let me explain a little about my personal experience concerning this matter.

To put it simply, I had involved myself in the development of Clinical Pastoral Education as a supervisor at St. Luke's International Hospital in Tokyo. CPE (Clinical Pastoral Education) is, although we will examine it fully later, in short: professional education for ministry which brings theological students, ordained clergy and qualified laypersons into supervised encounter with living human documents in order to develop their pastoral identity and interpersonal competence. Accordingly, it is a method of developing personal and professional growth in ministry, a distinctive feature of which is practical experience of ministry under supervision, normally but not always in a hospital setting.

While I was involved into the CPE course for many years, on the other hand I had committed myself to a struggle for social justice, and especially for the Korean minority who are severely discriminated against by the Japanese people. Both activities brought it seriously to my notice that we must have a new

perspective of integration in pastoral care and theology between care for individuals and care for wider society. Many pastoral theologians in Japan incline to focus entirely on the personal and individual levels of human existence and experience. Consequently, they have tended to pay exclusive attention to emotional and interpersonal issues to the neglect of the issues of justice and social forces in the environment that actually shape individual lives. On the other hand, social activists have tended not to know what to do about the emotional issues that inevitably lurk in the course of their planning and efforts at implementation. In short, there is an urgent need for pastoral care to situate itself in the wider social context, without losing sight of care for individuals. Undoubtedly the wider social and political dimension is integral to the nature of pastoral care to help every person and the environment live and love together. We must consequently create a perspective for pastoral practice that can no longer collude with the social forces of injustice and oppression.

Now concerning an outline of the study, it begins with a general introduction to the historical background of the Japanese Church. We briefly trace the historical process of Japanese Christianity, and examine the characteristics and the deficiencies of Japanese pastoral practice in the historical and cultural context of Japanese society (Chapter 1). At this point we particularly take a glance at modern Japanese history in terms of the modern Tenno system. Moreover, since the Tenno system has been the largest obstacle for Christian mission and ministry in Japan, we must tackle it squarely again in chapter 4 to find out the agendas for pastoral care in the Japanese society.

Chapter 2 is a central part of our investigation, showing that the modern pastoral care movement has been particularly well developed in the United States. We intended to focus on Clinical Pastoral Education, because it has formed the main line for the pastoral care movement in America. However, after the 1970s CPE movement was severely questioned by lack of social concern. At that time, however, the Civil Rights Movement and Black Liberation Movement brought about a great impetus to transform the conventional norms and the structure of American society. Later on, it had an impact on the new directions in the American pastoral theology. To put it another way, psychologically informed pastoral theology has been gradually changing into socially aware pastoral theology, especially after the 1980s.

In turn, the British pastoral care tradition differs from the American over the

influence of psychology and psychotherapy; there is an ignorance about ways in which such a psychological approach can be more effective in the pastoral situation. Yet, in chapter 3 we can see the new advances in British pastoral theology from the eminent pastoral theologians, Frank Lake and Robert V. Lambourne. Both figures, although there were differences in theory and practice between them, undoubtedly made a great impact on the development of modern pastoral theology in the United Kingdom. Admittedly, it is probably fair to say that in distinction from American pastoral care, the main line of British modern pastoral theology was not dominated by psychologically informed pastoral care. Rather, it is situated in ecclesial and social settings. Therefore there is a strong stream of pastoral theology which has stressed the social-political location of pastoral theology, as observed in Peter Selby, Alastair Campbell and Stephen Pattison.

Thus, acknowledging the recent directions in western pastoral theology, in chapter 4 we go back to the Japanese social context in terms of the Tenno system. As indicated earlier, here lies a crucial issue for the Japanese Church and society, that is to say, because of the nature of the Tenno system which is actually based on a 'family-state ideology', many minorities, such as the resident Koreans, *buraku* (outcast) people and so on, are exceedingly marginalized in the society as outsiders. Therefore, it is possible to regard the Tenno (system) as a tribal God (Religion). Furthermore, in chapter 5 we must scrutinise the tasks of pastoral care in this context, and open up a new perspective of pastoral care and theology in Japan. Although there are a lot of difference between the western context and Japanese context, surprisingly we shall recognize a remarkable convergence in that pastoral theology in both contexts is trying to re-construct itself in a form of 'theology of culture' which aims to transform both individuals and society.

Concerning the main materials of this study, I have owed so much in my research particularly to two scholars, Alan Suggate and his excellent study of Japanese Christianity in *Japanese Christians and Society* (Peter Lang, 1996); and Stephen Pattison, an original and critical thinker of pastoral theology, whose excellent works *A Critique of Pastoral Care* (Second edition, SCM, 1994) and *Liberation Theology and Pastoral Care* (Cambridge, 1994) have been enormously valuable for my investigation.

CHAPTER 1 THE JAPANESE CHURCH IN HISTORY AND SOCIETY

1. A BRIEF HISTORICAL SKETCH OF THE JAPANESE CHURCH

Introduction to Japan

The first encounter between Christianity and the Japanese began in 1549 with arrival of three Jesuit missionaries, Francis Xavier (1506-52) with two companions. Xavier made efforts to understand the Japanese mentality and arrived at the conclusion, from his acquired knowledge, that Christian evangelization should be targeted on the ruling class, invariably attempting to gain the favor and permission and support of the feudal lords for his activities.[1] At that time, Japan was in the midst of chaotic political confusion through military strife and there did not exist a unified rule controlling the whole country, so that there was no central government that could forbid the missionary activities in Japan. Therefore, in general the early missionaries were well received by local rulers, who often associated them with the lucrative Portuguese trade. Consequently, within 30 years of its introduction Christianity the number of Christians was reckoned to be about 150,000[2].

Meanwhile the national unifier Oda Nobunaga[3] specially favoured the missionaries and granted them generous concessions. In 1579 the Jesuit Alessandro Valignano (1539-1606) arrived to conduct the first of three inspection tours of the mission. He insisted on missionary adaptation to the vernacular (Japanese) culture or custom, and set out detailed rules concerning language, housing, and etiquette[4].

After Nobunaga's sudden death by treason in 1582, his successor, Toyotomi Hideyoshi, seemed favorably disposed toward Christianity at first, but he became suspicious that it might become the basis for subversive cooperation among the feudal lords of Kyushu[5]. Therefore he immediately issued an order expelling missionaries from Japan in 1587. It happened that twenty-six Christians (both foreigners and Japanese) were crucified at Nagasaki in 1597.

After Hideyoshi's death, Tokugawa Ieyasu as the new ruler of Japan, was at first willing to tolerate the missionaries but gradually turned against Christianity. In 1614 the Tokugawa shogunate proscribed Christianity and finally issued the Great Edict of annihilation aimed at the complete extinction of the Christian church throughout the country. During the shogunate of Tokugawa Iemitsu(1623-51), the harsh orders were issued forbidding Japanese ships or citizens to leave the country without a special sanction, and enforced by the death penalty.

In this connection Iemitsu also established the system known as the 'Danka Seido', whereby every Japanese household was required to register its affiliation with

Buddhism at one of the local Buddhist temples. This made Buddhism in effect a state institution and a part of the government's system of social control. In addition, the people were divided into groups of five families, called 'Gonin-Gumi', for collective responsibility. In other words, people had to spy on their neighbours and verify that they were not related to the subversive religion of Christianity. And further, related to this whole system of surveillance was the most infamous practice of 'Ebumi (picture trampling)'. All citizens of Japan were forced to step on a holy picture or bronze medal (*Fumie*), as a proof that they were not Christians." Of this use of the Fumie, therefore, Richard H. Drummond states, "This practice was only part of the extensive system of surveillance carried on throughout the country, but perhaps more than anything else it symbolised the government's hostility toward Christianity, from which in turn an abhorrence of the faith as an evil thing developed among the general populace."[6]

Now the Christian church became the 'Church of martyrdom' in that a total of 3,000 believers are estimated to have been martyred. In 1639, the government issued its final 'Sakoku (the national policy of isolation or seclusion)'. Therefore, it was as 'Kakure Kirishitan' (Hidden Christians) that Christians as underground sects survived for over 200 years in spite of the almost total eradication of Christianity[7]. It is obvious how the long isolation of Japan has affected the exclusivist collectivism of the Japanese culture in its deep cultural and religious code or ethos.[8] As a result, Christianity was viewed as a potential danger because its monotheism placed absolute loyalty to God before loyalty to earthly authorities. In relation to overwhelming importance to unconditional obedience to superiors, the Tokugawa shogunate officially established a firm hierarchical system of occupational distinctions based on Confucian ideas, so that the people were divided into 4 class categories; Samurai warriors, farmers, artisans and merchants. Besides the main 4 classes, there existed outcasts ('Hinin' or 'Eta') at the very bottom.[9]

Looking back over all that happened in Japan's first encounter with Christianity, it it should be noted here how deeply the persecution and isolation has influenced Christian mission in Japan. The horrible persecution, surveillance, and long seclusion were Japan's answer to the first Christian challenge, which had implanted an anti-Christian and anti-foreign image deeply into Japanese society and culture. Consequently, the image has penetrated and become embedded even today in the depths of the minds and hearts of the Japanese populace.

Reintroduction of Christianity

The policy of Japan's isolation was brought to an end by the arrival of Commodore

Perry from the United States in 1853 and again in 1854. It opened the way for the second entrance of missionaries to Japan.

Then, within 15 years of the Perry's arrival, the Shogunate presiding over a coalition of feudal lords for two and a half centuries massively collapsed and at last handed over its powers to a new government in what is known as the Meiji Restoration of 1867.

The new Meiji government implemented a wide range of measures modelled on European examples and designed to set Japan on its way to becoming a modern nation as soon as possible. When the new government proceeded to modernize Japan by the 'vertical' power of the ruling elite, it sought to create an authoritarian Imperial state based on European constitutions. In short, the Meiji Constitution of the Empire of Japan in 1889 guaranteed only qualified religious freedom 'within limits not prejudicial to peace and not antagonistic to their [believers'] duties as citizens.' This qualification was later to be invoked against Christians in times of extreme nationalism, but until around 1890, missionary stations of the Christian Church after its activity resumed in Japan, had been established in most of the important cities and even in the rural areas.[10] Christian missions had a considerable impact upon the process of Japanese modernization, and became a significant force in its cultural life.

However nationalistic ideology gradually increased in the late 1880s, and a strong reaction against 'Western Christianity' set in once again. Especially, after the Meiji Constitution of 1889 and the Imperial Rescript on Education of 1890, the government had made Shinto the State religion and had forced all Japanese publicly to revere the Tenno (Emperor) as the integrating core of national and cultural identity. This nationalistic ideology centred on the Tenno was accelerated in the society of Japan by the imperialist pillage of China in 1894-5, and victory in the Russo-Japanese War in 1904-5. Consequently, the feelings of suspicion toward Christianity, in short, the doubts about the patriotic loyalty of Christians, was very often thrown in focus by the 'foreign character' of it. As a result, in the Japanese Church, "Apart from a few, almost all Christians showed complete loyalty to the Tenno during these wars, thus identifying Christianity with the imperial ideology."[11]

Yet there were other sides to Christianity in this period. Some Christians made a notable contribution to the foundation and development of the socialist and trade union movements in an effort to solve the grave social problems caused by rapid capitalistic industrialisation.[12] Unfortunately, despite their contribution at the time of their foundation, almost all the Japanese Christian socialists later withdrew from the revolutionary Marxist groups, partly because these groups were driven to be more

militant and anarchistic against the Meiji oligarchy, and much of the initial Christian influence was weakened or lost in these movements.[13]

In the first two decades of the 20 Century, the Japanese nation was pushing forward towards marauding imperialism internationally, but domestically it was a time of the emergence of liberal thoughts and cultural movements within the restrictions on freedom. Christian churches primarily aimed to establish and promote denominational and institutional development, all the more because the nationalist spirit was antipathetical to the churches.

At the same time, quite a few Christians opened up the field of social and medical work. They pioneered almost alone the work to extend their hands to people who had been neglected and marginalized in society. Especially in social welfare they founded many institutions such as hospitals, sanatoriums, leprosy colonies, orphanages, old-people's homes, institutions for mentally retarded children and so on.

Meanwhile, however, a strong trend towards nationalism was beginning to rise in the country again in order to further imperialist expansion that was advocated in the name of so-called 'Great East Asia Co-prosperity'. Also militarism was growing as Japan gained territory in Manchuria during the 1930s. So the elimination of foreign influences was called for openly once again. The Japanese Christians were divided at that time as to where to place their loyalty. In particular, a special problem was to what extent Christians might acquiesce in Shinto requirements which the government defined as national obligations, and involved public acknowledgement of the divine ancestry of the Tenno. Thus, the growing spirit of nationalism raised problems of conscience for Christians, especially when the authorities urged attendance at Shinto shrines as 'a civil manifestation of loyalty'. After prolonged negotiations a compromise was reached with the government authorities, in short, such ceremonies were permissible to accept as 'a civil manifestation of loyalty' and 'reverence toward the imperial family'. The National Christian Council of Protestant Churches basically concurred with this interpretation.[14] But there is no doubt that attendance at Shinto shrines during the ultra-patriotic 1930s and the subsequent Pacific War was to cause a dilemma of conscience for many devoted Christians.

In 1941 to gain further control, the Government compelled Japanese churches to form a single organisation, namely, the Nihon Kirisuto Kyodan (the United Church of Christ in Japan), a union of some 30 Protestant churches entirely administered by Japanese. The Anglican-Episcopal church and a few other denominations that refused to join, including the Salvation Army, Holiness Churches, all ceased to exist officially until the abolition of the Religious Bodies Control Law in 1945.

From the Postwar period to Present

Shortly after the war opportunity arose for a marked increase in Christian activity. The social upheaval and disillusionment was caused by the nation's exhaustion from war. Also it certainly resulted from the Allied Occupation of 1945-52 that was in favour of Christianity. Subsequently, in 1946 Tenno Hirohito denied his own divinity and in 1947 the new Constitution of Japan was promulgated which is based on the sovereignty of the people, not the Tenno. It was for Japanese Christianity the first time that technically, there had been freedom of religion that should be at the core for all the human rights.

Meanwhile the Korean War began in 1950. In the first period of the postwar Allied Occupation there was thoroughly carried out the complete disarmament of Japan required by the Potsdam Declaration. However, with the deterioration of relations between the United States and the Soviet Union, especially by the outbreak of the Korean War, U.S. policy definitely shifted toward the rearmament of Japan. The U.S. armed force in Japan negotiated with the Japanese government about Japan's commitment to collective security arrangements in the age of the Cold War. Consequently this provoked a heightening of the anti-war movement within Japan about 1960. However, it should be noted that the Japanese Church as a whole had not yet fully acquired a political and historical consciousness of Japanese society. In other words, for a long time the Japanese Church had still seen itself 'as the victims of the government's ill-conceived designs'; whereas it touched only lightly on the church's wartime responsibility and could not scrutinize itself through the eyes of Asian neighbours who were victims of the abuses of power by Japan.[15] Later on, this historical understanding was severely challenged as the unsolved question of war responsibility, and eventually in 1967 the United Church of Christ (Kyodan) took the initiative to issue its 'Confession of Responsibility during World War Two' in 1967 as a declaration from the Japanese Churches.

During the Korean war Japan had achieved considerable economic recovery on account of providing a staging area for supplies and then had entered into the period of so called 'High economic progress' in the 1960s, resulting in the 'economic giant or animal' of the 1970s.

Alongside its economic success and expansion Neo-nationalism emerged from the power elite. The State support for the nationalization of the 'Yasukuni Shrine' of the war dead represented the most obvious symptom of this nationalistic fever. Therefore,

after the Second World War the anti-Yasukuni movement became the most important task not only for the Japanese Christian, but also for those who stood for the Constitution as well. Afterwards to some extent the Japanese Church increasingly realized the importance of Christian responsibility to achieve a more just and equal society. However, in some churches there were an increasingly number of controversies and splits over the task for Church and Society. Even so, the Japanese Churches, including the Catholic Church in Japan after the Second Vatican Council, undoubtedly have been pursuing the social witness of their mission and promoting cooperative work and action for social justice. These concerns quite clearly emerged in tackling the issues that were focused on the war responsibility of Japan in the funeral ceremony of the Showa Tenno of 1989, the enthronement ceremony of the new Tenno and especially in the 50th anniversary of the defeat of the Second World War of 1995.

Although the number of professed Japanese Christians is still small and makes up a little less than one percent of the total population, Christian influence is more widespread than this low figure might suggest. There are various problems which the Christian churches must resolve before the Christian Gospel can reach the mainstream of Japanese life. The Japanese Church as a creative minority, will have many opportunities to work more faithfully for evangelization of the Japanese people and Society and the Kingdom of God.

2. THE MAJOR CHARACTERISTICS OF JAPANESE CHRISTIANITY

As already observed, in modern Japan's history the heaviest task of the Japanese Christians has been centred on the social ethos and ideology of emperor worship. The imperial institution as an authoritative framework for the Japanese people has implicitly and explicitly functioned in the various value systems, such as the dignified loyalty to the emperor and the ethic of patriotism. Especially, the educational ideals established by the absolute Meiji oligarchy, culminating in the 'Kokutai no Hongi (Principles of the National Entity)' in 1936 and 'Shinmin no Michi (The Way of the Subjects)' in 1941. These emphasized ultra-nationalism based on a mythological concept of history and the family-state ideology, and became the utterly dominant ideology as orthodoxy for the Japanese people. As a result, if someone claimed different values, criticized or opposed this national manifest principle, this person was accused of heresy against the state socially and politically, as un-Japanese, anti-national and disloyal. Thus, Japanese Christianity was doubly branded as 'paganism', i.e. upholding a different value system from the traditional ethos, and then as 'heresy' under the emperor system. It meant, therefore, that the emperor

system took hold of the assumption that, whatever their private religion or ideology, every Japanese should belong in and pursue the national destiny as expressed through the emperor system.

In this vein, we can now consider Japanese Christianity in a critical way to show what are its major characteristics and how these have been formed in terms of the social context of Japan. In other words, the issue is how Christianity, when encountering Japanese society and culture, was affected by Japanese immanent ethos, and in turn, how it could bring about renovation in the traditional social structure.

Presumably, it is appropriate to say that the several characteristics of Japanese Christianity have emerged from the social historical context of Japan.

(1) Urban-Middle Class Church

It is not too much to say that Christianity in Japan is "an urban, middle class intellectual's religion"[16] It is not surprising that most Japanese Christians come from the same background; they are from the middle class and are engaged in typically middle-class occupations. This does not mean of course that Christian influence has not been extended to workers or peasants. Such people, however, are rather exceptional in the Japanese Church, as are also members of the upper class.

Therefore, the question arises as to why the Church is so largely urban middle-class in its membership. To put it simply, the reason why the Japanese Church is composed mainly of intelligentsia of the urban middle-class is the relatively strong influence of the traditional social structure. In other words, what affected Japanese people more strongly was the traditional social structure with its characteristic social relationships and thought, and this was a great obstacle to their understanding and accepting Christianity. Resistance to Christianity was spearheaded by ubiquitous local and kinship communities, because these had their religious and integrating centre in their social customs[17]. As a result, new believers of Christianity tended to come from people who were relatively free of the constraints and obligations of local and kinship communities.

Hence, from the beginning Christianity has spread in the cities where this traditional value and custom is relatively weak, and especially among the middle-class intelligentsia, rather than in the rural areas where these are strong even up to the present. That is, it is above all middle-class people, such as teachers, business workers and students, who have struggled to free themselves from the hold of the tradition, who are attracted to Christianity, and those who had few obligations in the local and kinship communities and therefore found it easier to maintain their faith,

although they usually dropped away from the church before long.

(2) Christianity as 'Yosai (Western Learning)'

The Japanese Church is regarded as a type of 'Yosai'. It means that Western Learning, mainly technical and practical knowledge which might serve the modernisation of Japan within the Japanese spirit. This phrase Yosai was a famous slogan that the elite used to advocate the ideology of 'Wakon Yosai'[18] to fulfill the urgent and huge requirement for the modernisation of Japan. It was an essential strategy to adopt western knowledge and technology in conformity with the unique Japanese spirit. The problem was how to unite together Japanese traditions and habits with western knowledge in Japanese civilisation without losing its cultural identity.

The ethos that Christianity is 'a foreign religion' is still quite strong among the common Japanese, and this sense of foreignness associated with Christianity has an inseparable relation to the Japanese sense of cultural and political identity. In other words, the Japanese Church has been involved in a homogeneous society which has retained its long tradition[19] and furthermore has been made up by the official ideology of the Tenno system.

It may well be said that Japanese culture, for its part, is often characterised as an open one that welcomes and embraces contributions from other cultures, but it has not been able to assimilate Christianity (in a similar way, not Marxism either). This appears to be due to the organic unity of the Christian religious system and its resultant universal character. In this sense, the openness of Japanese culture is the openness with fixed limits, the boundaries being assimilated to Japanese traditions and habits. Whatever threatens these limits is not tolerated but excluded.
Therefore, the homogeneity of Japanese society gives rise to a pronounced inclination to distinguish sharply between what is foreign and what is domestic.[20].

When the western missionaries engaged in their missionary works, they were ready to utilise western civilisation as an expedient for their evangelism. Consequently, Christianity was popularly identified with the West. However, Christianity also introduced into Japan along with western civilization an intention to teach Japanese people a new way of living and new sense of humanity. Undoubtedly, such enthusiasm for the new religion became doubtless a motivating force for a variety of educational and social works, because, poverty and physical handicaps had been regarded as the result of the sins or moral failings of the society. However, most Christians were looked on with suspicion by the public because Christianity was regarded as a 'subversive creed' which collides with the national identity. For a long

time it was impossible for a Christian to teach in the primary schools and also to perform Christian services and rituals, even in the Christian schools[21].

Christianity remains on the periphery of the cultural setting of Japan. On account of this, Christianity was accepted and treated only as a kind of practical Western knowledge, primarily in education and moral teaching, but it was prevented as a religion from penetrating the whole public life of Japan.

It is important to point out that usual Japanese word for Church is 'Kyokai', which literally means 'teaching association'. It may be numbered as one of the serious mistakes[22] in the Japanese translation of theological terminology.

(3) The Dualistic Attitude and Privatisation of Christian Faith

Under the circumstances mentioned above, Japanese Christianity came to embrace a dualistic view of the relation between religious life and life in society.

Historically such a separation between religious life and social life has been the product of the collision of the two. When the Christians of the early centuries attempted to translate their faith into social life, they met violent persecution from their society, and came to devise a dualistic view of the two aspects of human life. However, even if the dualism of Christian faith helped to preserve the purity of its faith, it would lead to the grave error of simply letting society run its accustomed course.

The Japanese Church was thus tinged with this dualism. It was due partly to the missionaries' background from the European and American Churches. Japanese Christianity, especially in the Meiji era, was greatly influenced by individualistic pietism that resulted mainly from the current of American Puritanism. In general, they held the belief that Christian faith should fundamentally be based on personal inwardness separated from this-worldliness. The aim of salvation was the plucking of an individual soul out of a sinful world and preparing people for glorious heaven. Simply stated, because of the attitude that concentrates exclusively on personal repentance and the saving of individual souls, most Japanese Christians were easily able to assimilate their Christianity to the Japanese nationalistic ideology.[23]

It is still quite a common tendency for Japanese Christians to draw a sharp distinction between private and public spheres of human life, but this is a fatal mistake of theological understanding. It is true that socially aware Christians in Japan insist on the separation of religion and the profane, but this is "not in order to privatise the Christian faith, but in order to assert the transcendence of God over all earthly rule"[24]. However many less aware Christians understand their faith in terms of a private affair, such as personal repentance and individual salvation. Accordingly,

this dichotomy leads Christian faith "to an escape from public responsibility into the area of private concerns' and 'private experience replaces public responsibility"[25].

Simultaneously, it can be pointed out that once the Christian Church had organized and established itself, it promptly made of its church a miniature closed society. Aware that Church people constituted a suspect minority group, they considered their churches as citadels that protect them from a hostile administration and accordingly developed close-knit ties among themselves. As a result, a great gap has been created between their religious life and the life of society. Hence, a prominent characteristic of the Japanese Church is its formation of 'privatised faith' or 'hidden Christian faith'.

3 THE PROBLEMS AND TASKS OF PASTORAL THEOLOGY IN JAPAN

We have briefly observed the historical background and the major characteristics of the Japanese Church in earlier sections of this chapter. Now it seems wise here to observe how pastoral practice has functioned in such social and cultural context of Japan.

(1) Pastoral Practice in the Prewar Years

It is very difficult to spell out accurately pastoral practice and how it was performed, and also investigated, in the prewar years, because it was before the distinctive concept of pastoral care was introduced into Japan. However, considering in general terms the mission and the ministry of the church in prewar Japan, it might be possible to deduce what were the main characteristics of the pastoral practice.

Before entering into the main topics, however, we should take into consideration how the Western missionaries understood Christian mission when they proclaimed the Christian Gospel in Japan, because Christian development and formation have been greatly indebted to their basic beliefs from prewar times up to now.

As very frequently pointed out, it can be said that all missionary efforts during the 19th century were dominated by the influence of Western Christendom, including its cultural and social attitudes, and as a result, Christian propagation was mingled with the ethos of Western civilisation.

Consequently, as John G. Davies stated in his outstanding books, the missionary movement since the 19th century operated on the basis of several corollaries[26]:

a) Religion is concerned primarily with the saving of souls.

b) Religion is concerned principally with the sphere of individual morality.

c) The salvation of society can only come about by the salvation of individuals.

d) The Church has to concern itself only with spiritual matters.

It will be very clear from these propositions what the Western missionaries understood as the Christian Mission and then how they aimed at working for it. It is obvious here that the Christian ministry was completely to do with the saving of souls. In other words, pastoral care meant to work for a person's own private and inner spiritual life. Accordingly, pastoral care came to focus exclusively on the sphere of individual experience through the emotions and the morality of each individual, and thus the salvation of society was intended to take place through caring for individuals.

However, as a matter of course, what defined and characterised pastoral care in Japan, was not merely the influences of the Western missionaries' idea, namely, individualistic pietism in the 19th century, but also those things definitely attributed to the Japanese social structure. Even though it is impossible to judge clearly to what extent the social force of the Tenno system affected the characteristics of Japanese Christianity in its spiritual and religious formation, it is indisputable that Japanese Christianity was completely characterised by its social circumstances as marginalised and privatised in society. As a result, it is quite understandable that the Japanese Church identified itself easily with the ark, "as Noah's ark, perilously afloat amidst the turbulent seas of this world; outside the safety of this vessel mankind is going down to destruction, and the only salvation is to be dragged from the deep into the safety of the ecclesiastical ship."[27] Hereby, Japanese Christians considered their Church as a citadel that protected them from this hostile environment, and came to draw a distinction between their religious life and their social life. Hence, from this situation the prominent ethos of the Japanese church formed, that is to say, privatized faith and a dualistic attitude (dichotomy) between Church and Society.

Therefore, concerning the pastoral practices in prewar years, we can point out briefly the three main characteristic features.

(a) A Too Narrow Christian Moralism

As noted earlier, the fact that the usual Japanese term for Church is '*Kyokai*', which literally means 'Teaching Association', from the beginning of Christian Mission in the Meiji era Christianity was regarded, and accepted, as a vehicle of practical Western knowledge. Conversely, it was made impossible for Christianity as a religion to pervade the whole public life of Japan. Consequently, while the Christian believer was strongly taught Christian moral duties in order to keep him/her pure (for example, as 'Kokorozashi' (Intentional Faith) of Uemura Masahisa), on the other hand, Christian discipline(morals) was also propagated as a kind of apologetics

toward the people, namely, in advocating public order and morals such as teetotalism and anti-smoking ('Bushido' [Japanese Chivalry] of Nitobe Inazo and 'Moralistic Conscience' of Ebina Danjo). In fact, one of the most typical impressions of Japanese Christianity is shown in the fact that even today many people hold the Christian Gospel to be a list of moral instructions. However, it is not an overstatement to say that when pastoral practice was performed as a means of the guidance in moral discipline, it led to many misunderstandings and dangers in the Christian mission to Japan, that is to say, a strong legalism, a punitive accent, a boastful consciousness of a moral elite and authoritarianism (clericalism).

(b) The Inner/Individualistic Tendency of Christian Faith

Historically, after the Three Religions Conference of 1912, in which Shintoism, Buddhism and Christianity were forced to establish a liaison with public affairs, the Japanese Church became extremely introverted, and concentrated its activities exclusively on personal repentance and the saving of individual souls. Very clearly, it helped to preserve the purity of Christian faith, which was aiming at saving an individual out of a sinful world and preparing people for heaven. However, needless to say, it led to a negligence of its social responsibility, letting society run its accustomed course. Here the Christian Churches may have become a kind of Noah's ark for Christians in their social estrangement, but it must be plainly recognised that such a Church could not interfere or protest at the official actions of society, much less alter them. We can see typical examples of this feature in Takakura Tokutaro who insisted upon 'the religion of self-pursuit' or 'the divine givenness of self' and on an introspective/contemplative spirituality of the Catholic discipline. Thus in this context, pastoral care very often reduced its focus to subjective feelings (Sentimentalism) and limited itself to the personal experience of a religious life in a sphere isolated from the world.

(c) Church-Centred Concern and Escapism from Society

It is true that Mission has frequently been regarded as Church extension or an activity in Church membership promotion. If so, however, it must be said that this concept is too narrow a concern and that it is desperately Church-centred. In fact, the Japanese Church has exerted almost all its energy in building an isolated religious compartment. Accordingly, it may well be applicable to the Japanese Church that "if Church extension be a defective concept of mission, so also is proselytism with which it is closely connected."[28] It is true that Christianity has contributed much to the advance of educational and medical work, and social welfare, along with an outstanding contribution to the foundation of the socialist movements. Nevertheless, as a matter of fact, very few Christians undertook these

social works with any substantial support from the Church, and therefore they had to bear their work almost alone for those who had been neglected and marginalized in society. In short, such social works had never been a main issue for the Church. Therefore these pioneering workers gradually departed from their Christian background and many Christian socialists finally withdrew from the frontline of the social movements and works, because there was scarcely the firm vision, and the consistent perspective for their Social Christianity among them.

Furthermore, as already mentioned in the previous chapter, the Dialectical theology represented by Karl Barth was introduced into Japan in the 1930s. Rather unexpectedly, this theological school functioned to lead to an escape from public responsibility. In other words, the strong emphasis upon the Church in Barth's theology indeed justified indifference to society and strengthened furthermore the Church-centred ethos, as Jürgen Moltmann once called it 'Absolute Transcendentalism'. Undoubtedly, this 'Escapism' or 'Church-Centredness', although it is totally 'an ecclesiological narrowing of the concept of the Kingdom of God'[29], was a most prominent feature in the mainstream of the Japanese Church.

(2) Pastoral Theology in the Post-War Years

In general, there is little difference between prewar and postwar times concerning the basic features of pastoral care and theology in Japan. However, it should be said that now pastoral theology in Japan has come to be much influenced by that of the United States after the Second World War. To be sure, there exist several reasons why pastoral theology in the United States has become popular among Japanese Christian ministers. Because of the weak social credibility of the Christian pastor's work, Christian ministers have very often faced difficulties in getting public appreciation of their ministry as a professional job. Undoubtedly, it seemed to the pastoral workers that the pastoral theology of the United States guaranteed and enhanced the significance of their pastoral works, as shown in pastoral counselling and psychotherapy, and the pastoral theology of the United States gave a clue for helping suffering individuals.

In the first place, in 1951 American educators led by W. P. Lloyd visited Japan and suggested the promotion of student counselling, which resulted in a visit by Carl Rogers in 1952. In 1953, W. P. Browning started to teach pastoral counselling at Tokyo Union Theological Seminary.[30] Thus, the pastoral care and counselling based on humanistic psychology gradually prevailed among Japanese pastors in the late 1950s and 1960, partly because a few Japanese pastors who studied in the U.S. came back to Japan and propagated such new pastoral theology at seminaries and

Churches. However it was not until 1964, when a famous American pastoral theologian Paul E. Johnson instructed about 60 pastors at Kyoto Baptist Hospital, that the term 'pastoral counselling' came to be accepted more widely in the Japanese Church. Simultaneously, the Japan Institute of Pastoral Counselling was organized in 1963 and the basic books by authors such as Wayne Oates, Seward Hiltner and P. Johnson were translated into Japanese. Meanwhile the humanistic psychology became popular and a wide range of training courses was set up throughout the country, especially Carl Rogers's client-centered therapy and non-directive counselling from 1950s initiated a counselling movement. There were two reasons why these individualistic psychologies have largely attained popularity in Japan. One came from the strong influence of existentialism, which emphasized the distinctive quality of human experience. Many people were interested in the thoughts of writers such as J-P Sartre, K. Jaspers, S. A. Kierkegaard and M. Heidegger, in which they were longing to find out the true meaning of life lost in the spiritual vacuum after the War defeat. Accordingly, it stimulated and motivated people to investigate their self-discovery and self-identity. The second was a long tradition of Buddhism, especially Zen Buddhism, which advocates each individual's awakening, stressing the ahistorical moment, as it were, the transcendental present. Obviously such Buddhist thinking is in favor of both existentialism and individualistic psychology.

In the sphere of Japanese Christianity, subsequently, the Japan Institute of Christian Education in St. Paul's University became a centre for T-group training from 1960s. From 1970s the clinical pastoral training started as a part of ministerial education in Tokyo and Kyoto. Then, in 1984 the Pastoral Care and Counselling Association of Japan (PCCAJ) was organised as a nationwide body in order that pastoral care and counselling might be more suitable for professional roles and practice. Accordingly, what defines the present pastoral care in Japan undoubtedly is counselling theory and practice. Here are some fundamental features in pastoral care and theology.

(a) The Inner/Individualistic Approach: Counselling Models

There is no doubt that Pastoral theology and practice in Japan, first of all, have been brought to a clear idea and method as a profession and an academic discipline by the pastoral care and counselling in the U.S. Now, if the aim of the previous pastoral model was the conversion of individual souls, the new model focuses its purpose in the problem-solving or the self-realisation of individuals by its counselling model. Briefly, it can be noted that there are two distinctive aspects resulting from this counselling model, namely, the one to one relationship and the problem-solving approach. Predictably, this model of pastoral care has the great advantage of offering

a concrete way for helping suffering persons, but here we cannot help finding the same problem as before, that is, on account of concentrating on an inner-individualistic approach, it leads inevitably to the neglect of the wider social context. In effect, it contains an inversion: despite the fact that the actual problem should define the method, instead, the method defines the problem. In other words, because of the method of the one-to-one counselling model, pastoral care is primarily prevented from becoming more socio-politically concerned and engaged. Here is the greatest danger and most serious weakness of the pastoral care effected by this counselling model. For, it is very important that the pastoral worker approaches his task in terms of the social structure in which each individual lives. For example, it would be too simple-minded if we considered sin only as personal transgressions in self-realisation and development. Therefore pastoral care can no longer limit its focus only to caring acts for individuals. Such sin, anger, and sorrow in most cases have their roots outside the individual person, and 'Poverty, inequality and injustice can be the agents and tools of evil and can stunt people just as effectively as personal misery or loss.'[31] However, pastoral care in Japan, in fact, has not overcome a strong tendency to neglect the external influences on human beings. For example, it can be instanced how most pastoral theologians in Japan are not able to engage properly with the issue of discrimination in their pastoral situation. Accordingly, pastoral care and counselling apparently reveals its inability to deal with the common tendency of Japanese Christianity to draw a distinction between the individual and society, and it seems likely to extend the split between them. Therefore pastoral care now has to transform its direction and widen its perspective to the corporate and public problems that influence the lives of individuals.

(b) Church-Centred and Paternalistic Paradigms

The pastoral model of Church Centered and Paternalistic paradigms is still a great impediment in fulfilling the pastoral ministry. It is very frequently said, in Japan, that the relationship of a pastor to a church member is apt to be that of a parent to children. Hence, the moral code of the traditional ethos has still been operating in the pastoral situation. In other words, while the pastor is easily trapped into authoritarianism, on the other hand the laity has tended to drop into dependence and an uncritical attitude, such as obedience to superiors, and loyalty to the authority.

Another aspect is the fact that, in general, the most common image of pastoral care in Japan is a personal service profession by the pastor. There are no connotations of corporate action by the community in this image. Therefore, it is quite natural that pastoral care is considered as the work only or primarily on behalf of particular

Christians and Christian communities. However, considering the Japanese context as a non-Christian country, this may be a greatly mistaken presupposition with regard to pastoral care in Japan.

(c) The Borrowings from Western Works and Reinventing the Wheel

To make matters worse, nothing is more dangerous than to just borrow from Western learning without a careful examination of the Japanese context. However, looking back to the history of pastoral theology in Japan, immediately it is noticeable how heavily it depended upon Western works without any consideration for the differences in religious, cultural and political contexts between Japan and other countries. To be sure, it is not only a problem of technique, but a fundamental question about what the methodology of Pastoral Theology should be and how it engages in a particular context and situation. Pastoral theologians have now been challenged to rethink the social relevance of their theology. In particular, quite a number of theologians have come to realise that in doing theology they should not primarily start from a theory or a text, but from an actual experience or situation. In this sense, it may well be said that the psychological counselling model of pastoral care presupposes a universal feature of human nature. Therefore, in different social structures and contexts, how can it be assumed that the psychological reality implies the same meaning in all cases? Hence, it is vital to integrate pastoral theology for the sake of right practice.

Another important problem is the reinventing of the wheel in pastoral practice, that is to say, we can hardly ever find out the fundamental documents and records, telling how pastoral care was practiced and was assessed. As a result, it is impossible to inherit preceding practices, develop them and transform them. Even if, therefore, there was a good example of work in the past, it is very difficult to revive it for the future. True, as for the records of pastoral practices, there are technical, methodological and theoretical difficulties caused from its character as a living document. Nevertheless, for the future development of pastoral practice it is necessary to invent how to compile documents of the practices worth examining, so as to escape reinventing the wheel.

From what has been said so far it may appear to so obvious that pastoral theology in Japan has various deficiencies and needs to step into alterative directions. Our main focus of survey is in exploring how and what a revised pastoral theology should be desirable, that is to say, for the purpose we must learn a lot of lesson from the modern pastoral theology in western experience. Particularly, in both the United Kingdom and the United States, pastoral theology recently has been challenged from various aspects, especially since the 1980s. Most importantly, it is the fact that many

pastoral theologians are trying to transform pastoral theology towards a common goal, that is, a more socially aware pastoral theology. At the center of my inquiry is concern for this direction, because here exists the same urgent need and task in order to fruitfully form and develop pastoral theology in Japan.

---

[1] George Elison, *Deus Destroyed: the Image of Christianity in Early Modern Japan,* p.25.

[2] Edwin O. Reischauer, *Japan: the Story of a Nation*□p.92.

[3] "Nobunaga's encouragement of the missionaries is explainable as a reaction of his avowed hate of Buddhist institutions and as a side effect of his effort to extinguish their threat forever." See Elison, op.cit.,p.26.

[4] Unuma Hiroko, *Nihon Kirisutokyo-shi,* p.16.

[5] Reischauer and Alberta M. Craig, Japan: *Tradition and Transformation,* p.79.

[6] Richard H. Drummond, *A History of Christianity in Japan,* p.11.

[7] Urakawa Kazusaburo, ' Uragami Kirishitan-shi' in *Nihon Kirisutokyo-shi,* pp.86-88.

[8] Furuya Yasuo, *Nihon No Shingaku,* Chapter 2.
It also might be noted that there is a positive evaluation about the isolation from an economic point of view. That is to say, the foundation for Japan's development into a modern nation was to a large extent laid during the years of seclusion. For example, the experience gained by the warrior class prepared them for running the new bureaucratic government and land and sea routes extensive enough to support nationwide commodity markets etc.

[9] This four-class system was abolished by the Outcast Emancipation Proclamation of 1871 after the Meiji Restoration. The Meiji government established three new categories; Kozoku(nobility), Shizoku(former samurai), and Heimin(commoners), but there still continued a new discriminating classification for outcasts as Shin(new)-Heimin.

[10] "It tolerated Christianity, however, not as a positive acknowledgement of the principle of religious freedom but primarily as a means by which to improve its image among Western powers, to facilitate the removal of the unequal treaties, and to attain equality with the West." See Yoshiya Abe, ' From Prohibition to Toleration: Japanese Government Views Regarding Christianity, 1854-73' in *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies,* Vol.2-3. 1978, p.132.

[11] Alan Suggate, *Japanese Christians and Society,* p.23.

[12] Shigenori Murakami, *Japanese Religion in Modern Century,* pp.61-64.

[13] It is a significant fact in the Meiji era that the Japanese Church had worked initially for liberation of *'Buraku'* people.
See Kudo Eiichi, *Kirisutokyo to Buraku Mondai.*

[14] It was one of the most sinful facts concerning the war responsibility of the Japanese Church that Tomita Mitsuru, the general secretary of the United Church of Christ in Japan, forced the Korean Christians to pass a resolution of Tenno worship under the pressure of the authorities in 1934.
Togshik Ryu, *Kankoku no Kirisutokyo,* pp.93-112.
Dohi Akio, *Nihon Protesutanto Kirisutokyo-shi,* pp.332-326.

[15] Dohi Akio, ibid., pp.416-417.

[16] Charles W.Iglehart, *A Century of Protestant Christianity in Japan,* p.346.

[17] As for 'Group Oriented Society' of Japan, it is a typical explanation, that 'the wet-paddy rice cultivation method made it necessary to work in groups and have a system of joint cooperation' See the very valuable works, Tamashiro Tetsu *Mizu-Shakai no Kozo,* and *Mizuno Shiso.*

[18] The phrase 'Wakon Yosai' was a famous slogan in the Meiji period, with 'a rich country and strong military (Fukoku Kyohei)', which claims the thought of adopting Western knowledge and technology to conform with the unique Japanese spirit.

[19] This long period of deliberate seclusion has continued to exercise an influence ---- Christians have been suspect because their faith was brought from the West. See James D. G. Dunn and Alan Suggate, *The Justice of God*, p.64.

[20] Alan Suggate, ibid., p.22,quoting in Fukutake Tadashi, *The Japanese Social Structure*, p.14.16.68.

[21] Standing in the line of the Meiji Constitution (1889) and the Imperial Rescript on Education (1890), 'Instruction Twelve'(1899) by the Ministry of Education became a serious impediment to educational endeavours in all Christian schools, because it announced that in all private schools religious worship or teaching is not permitted. For more details Dohi Akio, op.cit, pp.127-132.and Charles W. Iglehart, op.cit, pp.110-111.

[22] Emil Brunner was the first to point this out during his teaching at a Christian University in Tokyo from 1953-55. See Nakazawa Koki, *Brunner and Japan.*

[23] Dohi Akio, op.cit.,pp.42-46, and Alan Suggate, op.cit, p.70.

[24] Alan Suggate, op.cit, p.89.

[25] J.G.Davies, *Worship and Mission*, pp.40-42.

[26] John Gordon Davies, *Worship and Mission*, Chapter 3 and *Dialogue with the World*, pp. 52-53.

[27] Davies, *Dialogue*, p. 19.

[28] Davies, *Worship*, pp. 53-54.

[29] Davies, *Dialogue*, p. 41.

[30] Nishigaki Tsyugikazu, 'East Asian Pastoral Care Movement' in Rodney J. Hunter (edit.), *Dictionary of Pastoral Care and Counseling*, pp.329-30.

[31] Stephen Pattison, *A Critique of Pastoral Care*, p.15.

CHAPTER 2 MODERN PASTORAL THEOLOGY IN THE UNITED STATES

1. THE FORMATION OF MODERN PASTORAL THEOLOGY

The Impact of Modern Psychological Science

Modern pastoral theology started out with two influential schools of thought, that is, the emergence of experimentalism in philosophy such as William James and John Dewey and modern psychological science such as Sigmund Freud. These human sciences at first greatly stimulated some ministers and theological educators, in particular those who tried to elaborate a new professional model against the ineffectiveness of traditional pastoral ministry. Thus, these ministers and educators were urged to take into account empirical learning based on scientific method for an effective pastoral ministry.

However, before we research into the main issue: the influences of the new philosophy and psychology upon modern pastoral theology, we should not overlook the important impetus already given by liberal theology for ministers to investigate a new style of pastoral care informed by the new sociological, psychological and psychoanalytic sciences. That is to say, from the perspective of liberal theology, God was manifesting himself in the immanent evolution of human history and its highest cultural achievements. Thus liberal theology strongly reasoned that the primary locus of God's activity was in historical progress, culminating in full human freedom as the children of God. Hence, the locus of divine providence was transferred from other-worldliness to within the historical world and the depth of human experience.[1] The doctrine of divine immanence made it possible to appreciate new human knowledge about the dynamic nature of human life and the world. Liberal theology was therefore willing to reinterpret religious experience by the theory and the method of the new philosophy and psychology.

The 'Immanuel Movement' and The Religious Education Association

The first venture to apply new psychological insights to pastoral care began among some Episcopalians in 1905. If the psychological and sociological sciences could be applied to the problem of religion, they believed, pastoral ministry then could be significantly developed. Thus, a leading figure, Elwood Worcester, organised in Boston the 'Emmanuel Movement', and set up a social settlement for clubs, camps and a gymnasium in the Emmanuel church. Surprisingly, a therapeutic community had already practised there what was later known as 'group therapy' and it was soon recognised to be an important tool for the amelioration of social injury.[2]

This movement had acquired its impetus from the psychology of religion, a new academic discipline, especially that of William James. He had greatly influenced modern pastoral theology as a whole by his notable idea of 'healthy mind' and 'sick soul'[3]: the basic purpose of modern pastoral care is to survey how even a sick soul is able to have a healthy mind. However, the most central thought of James which had directly contributed to the Emmanuel movement was the claim that the 'law' of effort and 'gospel' of relaxation were interconnected to each other, that is, relaxation was the prelude to self-control; self-forgetfulness was a step toward the formation of character.[4] Accordingly, the founders of the movement interpreted pastoral practice as a guiding process of relaxation and control of the self toward rational consciousness. However, as for the influence of this movement, although the movement pioneered the introduction of this new psychology into theological thinking, it could hardly be said that the movement reached the seminaries and local churches. Worcester hoped to establish an education centre, 'a school of prayer', where students of medicine, theology, and sociology might work together, but there was only one theological school which agreed with him, and apart from this, nothing happened to this plan.[5] According to Edward E. Thornton, three factors contributed to its failure: first, its leader failed to train other ministers, second, Worcester had an extremely authoritarian attitude in his leadership, and lastly, the doctor-clergy relationship broke down.[6]

Far more influential than the Emmanuel Movement on the development of the pastoral care movement was the religious education movement. George A. Coe and a few seminary professors formed a Religious Education Association in 1903 and started to teach 'pastoral psychology' to ministers within the seminaries and churches. These religious educators, influenced by John Dewey, insisted that the fundamental theme of pastoral care was 'adjustment', namely, to create in maladjusted persons the ability to readjust themselves.[7] Hence Coe defined education as a "reconstruction or reorganisation of experience, and that education was a continual adjustment to an environment, but not in the sense of conformity to external conditions."[8] For Coe, like Dewey, the achievement of selfhood was a process of growth in terms of the social environment, because it was clear that human selfhood could not realise its full meaning in a self detached from social institutions and relationships. Accordingly, although Coe emphasised strongly that religious education was to assist self-realisation toward social adjustment, he held to his argument that personality disorder was a sign of social pathology.

The Beginning of the Clinical Pastoral Education (CPE) Movement

The ten years between 1919 and 1929 seemed at the time to be 'the Period of the Psyche'[9], which is frequently called later 'the first psychological revival'. In the background of this situation modern industrialisation was dramatically changing forms, structures and human relationships in factory and business. Particularly, the white-collar middle class was growing in number and came to dominate the norms and climate of culture. The change in the industrial system, "exemplified both by the early prosperity and by the continued expansion of the white-collar middle class, helped to shift popular interest from the 'building of character' to the creation of a 'good personality'-a term that meant adaptability, cheer, and the ability to work smoothly with others."[10] At the same time, a lot of popular psychological manuals were sold informing people how to manage human relationships and how to sell things, including themselves. Accordingly, the thinking of popular psychology inevitably penetrated into the churches through middle class business people and the psychological manuals. Some of the pastoral theologians started to object to such a success-culture and spoke against the popular understanding of psychology as a key to success.

Apart from this, however, a few groups of innovators in theological education emerged during the 1920s to create new patterns of ministerial formation known eventually as clinical pastoral education (CPE). In 1923, the Episcopalian physician William S. Keller founded a summer school in social service in Cincinnati. He encouraged theological students to learn from their work experiences in social agencies under social casework supervision. He was convinced that there is no place in which the ethical and spiritual values have so much reality as in the social order, and there is no way that organised religion can realise ethical and spiritual values save by social action.[11] In short, Keller's educational vision was to train 'social engineers'[12]. However, in spite of Keller's expectation that students would learn "to correlate the social with the spiritual approach and to tie-up the practical social approach with pastoral office," in fact, the Cincinnati program only exposed students to various opportunities for making contact with real life, including human suffering. It was often said concerning the summer school in Cincinnati that introducing social work into theological education was clearly an innovative style in ministerial formation, but regrettably, in Keller's programme theological supervision was decisively insufficient and underdeveloped.[13] Nevertheless, it should be noted here which the CPE was first to launch a new venture informed by social work, and not only by Freudian psychoanalysis. Furthermore, clinical training's attempt to equip ministers for 'social engineering' undoubtedly became an important hallmark in the

CPE movement. However, due to such historical accidents as Keller's successor, Joseph Fletcher, who transferred the program from Cincinnati to Boston, and also the outbreak of the Second World War, unfortunately the summer school at last disappeared. Later on, Cincinnati's social concern and its pastoral perspective of community organisation was to be increasingly re-evaluated as an alternative model of the CPE tradition in the discussion on the social scope and location of pastoral care during the 1970s.[14]

Meanwhile, however, another new venture in clinical pastoral training was initiated by Richard Cabot and Anton Boisen. A neurologist and cardiologist, Cabot was well known as the person who instituted medical social work in hospitals. He had a strong belief that it was essential for medical institutions to understand the 'patient's character under adversity' and his/her social background. In 1925 Richard Cabot published a 'Plea for a Clinical Year in the Course of Theological Study', because he was surprised to learn that theological schools provided students with no training and no practice in pastoral work.

In doing so, he urged theological educators to develop what he called a clinical theology. What was clinical theology? Clinical theology could be defined as a concern with the sick, the bereaved, and the dying. Therefore he said that "every theologian should be able to apply his psychology for the assistance of those who need God to help them face their suffering."[15] Thus he expected that the exposure of theological students to people suffering in hospitals would enhance their capacities for ministry.[16] Meanwhile, unexpectedly his idea came to be realised before the end of the year, because Anton Boisen was now appointed to be hospital chaplain and started, with the support of Cabot, a training course with several students at Worcester State Hospital.

Boisen had himself been hospitalised with mental illness three times from 1898 to 1935. He hoped to use his own case and experience for his work at the psychiatric hospital.[17] Boisen was interested in the psychology of religion, and he tried to explore a new interpretation of mental illness as a resource for religious experience through the intellectual influence of William James. Furthermore Boisen, inspired by Cabot, valued the first-hand study of cases, and designed clinical training "as an occasion for introducing students to 'living human documents' from whom they might derive insight into sin, salvation, and religious experience."[18] He thought that "a student could still pass through almost any of our theological schools...without ever having studied the human personality in either health or disease," and consequently "a physician of souls ...has become merely the custodian of the faith."[19] Thus, he expected that clinical pastoral training would become both a model for theological

education and a means of exploring religious experience. Boisen was not trying to introduce anything new into the theological curriculum except a new approach to ancient problems: the problem of sin and salvation.[20] However his other objective of constructing a clinical theology by the psychological interpretation of mental health, was not always accepted. Cabot in particular was opposed to it throughout.[21] As a result, although Boisen unquestionably ignited the CPE movement, Philip Guiles, Boisen's successor, substantially assumed leadership over the organisation. Thus, in 1930, Cabot, Guiles, and others formed the Council for Clinical Training of Theological Students who could provide the theological students with a long-term supervised encounter with men and women in crisis in hospitals, prisons, and social agencies. From that time on, this new form of theological education grew rapidly and then transformed dramatically the prevailing conceptions of pastoral care. However, Boisen remained on the periphery of the Council for clinical training from 1930 until his death because "the discrepancies between Boisen's goals and those of the national Council for Clinical Training had become more and more apparent."[22]

The Two Groups in the Clinical Pastoral Training

There was a major split between the two groups in clinical pastoral training almost from the beginning, because they had fundamentally different views about human nature and pastoral care. Indeed, as someone said satirically, "the personality adjustment people can't adjust."[23] The two groups definitely came to a decisive rupture from about 1932, and the members who worked with Cabot then formed their own organisation in Boston: the New England Theological Schools Committee on Clinical Training. On the other hand, the members, who were under the influence of the psychiatrist Helen Flanders Dunbar, began to organise the Council for Clinical Training in the centre of New York by 1938. Later on, however, in 1967, with the expansion of the clinical pastoral movement, the two groups finally were to join in a new organisation: the Association for Clinical Pastoral Education.[24] However, here it might be better to look back briefly at the main features of both the New England and the New York groups, because it seems that both the traditions highlighted considerably important factors in the history of American pastoral care.

<The New England Group>

As Cabot criticised "the psychological-medical group which today dominates public opinion almost as the medieval church did,"[25] he was basically sceptical about psychoanalysis or other forms of psychotherapy. His main concern was with human development or personal growth than the psychoanalytic interpretation of human

nature, and also with practical methodology rather than the theoretical survey of clinical training. On this point, as already observed in Cabot's attitude to Boisen, he was indeed different from Boisen who was concerned with the interpretation of spiritual life and attached greater importance to insight or understanding than to skill or technique. Accordingly, Cabot's firm stance on psychiatry became a decisive factor in causing a split between the New England group and the New York group, who gathered around Helen Flanders Dunbar. In fact, Cabot strongly advised "ministers to leave mental problems to the medically trained, and warned that the treatment of 'insanity' by ministers is done at the peril not only of their patients but of their own position in the community."[26]

Now the New England Theological Schools Committee on Clinical Training, as the name suggested, strongly emphasised "making clinical training a means of preparing men [*sic*] for the general pastoral ministry,' and 'the relevance of clinical training to the total range of pastoral functioning rather than simply to the pastor's work with the sick."[27] In other words, this group attempted to train the seminarians in terms of traditional pastoral ministry, and emphasised methodological innovation rather than psychiatric personality theory.

Particularly, Cabot's great interest in the methodology was inherited by Russel Dicks, who became the first full-time chaplain at Massachusetts General Hospital. Unlike Boisen who was interested in the interpretation of spiritual life or Keller who had social concern, Dicks's concern was just concentrated on 'how to deal with the situation I faced in the sickroom.'[28] As a result, he devised 'verbatims' of written conversations - word for word transcriptions - in developing Cabot's techniques of social case work. He believed that "the study of the immediate encounter between a student and a patient could reveal the congruence or disparity between the student's perceptions and intentions, on the one hand, and the realities of the situation, on the other."[29] The verbatim became a standard tool for CPE amongst the New England Group.

In *The Art of Ministering to the Sick* by R.Cabot and R.Dicks, Dicks therefore emphasised good listening in the pastoral ministry by which ministers could undertake the responsibility for providing the sick with the opportunity to find healing for themselves without being judgmental.

Austin Philip Guiles introduced 'depth psychology' into the pastoral ministry, and in doing so sought to instruct his clinical students in the conflict between moral guilt and the unconscious guilt which disturbs human life and behaviour in reality. Guiles, in co-operation with David R. Hunter, chaplain at Massachusetts General Hospital, reorganised in Boston the New England Theological Schools Committee on

Clinical Training. However, it lasted only a short time, and to replace it, Rollin Fairbanks re-established an Institute for Pastoral Care (1944), and was the first executive director. He steadily built up close relationships with seminaries in the Boston area. In addition, he opened a counselling center in Boston, but his counselling models were basically drawn from social work, not from psychoanalysis. It was partly because he had been a consistent opponent of those who had the tendency to over-emphasise pathological aspects of the personality among clinical supervisors and pastoral counsellors. Accordingly, as a whole, since the New England group was under the influences of both Boston personalism and theological liberalism, it was maintained that "the cure of souls was more deeply in touch with reality when the pastor aided men and women to grow into maturity as persons."[30]

<The New York Group>

It is not an overstatement to say that the members of this group were advocates of psychoanalysis. They were led by Dunbar, who had studied psychoanalysis in both Vienna and Zurich. They wanted enthusiastically to instruct the students in a clear concept of psychotherapy or psychoanalysis as a powerful tool for pastoral work. That is to say, on the one hand, the New England group, by emphasising the human capacity for rationality and purposive growth within the personality, were interested in ethical formation. The New York group, on the other hand, was attracted to the human potentiality of chaotic impulsiveness within the self, and emphasised human freedom from the conventional moral code and destructive legalism. It was true that the members were inspired in their dominant metaphors by the ideas of Anton Boisen, but they proceeded to develop them further, especially in their great concern for the turbulence of the inner self. Therefore, when Dunbar insisted that psychoanalytic technique ought to be introduced into clinical training, Boisen was concerned about the uncritical acceptance of psychotherapy, (especially Freud, and particularly Wilhelm Reich and his theories about sexuality and relaxation) within the Council for Clinical Training.[31] Nevertheless, it may well be said that there was a consensus within the New York group that we could understand "the spiritual heights of human nature only when we opened our eyes to a full view of human disorders."[32] They were firmly convinced that these new human psychologies were vital for pastoral care to create new visions and develop its future ministry.

To summarise where the significant differences between both groups existed: As for the New England Group, it preferred general hospitals as the primary place for clinical pastoral training and intended to educate mainly theological students or parish ministers. It emphasised the educational method, namely, the Dicks approach

(verbatims) as the basic supervisory tool. Hence, its main educational intention was in the 'shepherding perspective' (shepherd of souls). Furthermore, it should be noted that the New England Group tried to keep a close relationship with seminaries. On the other hand, the New York group preferred psychiatric hospitals and was interested mainly in training specialised functioning chaplains. Accordingly, it stressed psychiatric oriented methods (pastoral counselling). Furthermore, its training aim was the 'healing perspective' (physician of souls).[33]

Surprisingly, after Anton Boisen began Clinical pastoral training in 1925, it took less than two decades for most of major seminaries to set up a permanent faculty to teach pastoral care and theology. At the same time, from the 1930s some important criticisms were made by prominent theologians who could not identify themselves with liberal theology, in other words, who were generally called 'neo-orthodox theologians.' For instance, H. Richard Niebuhr pointed out the strong inclination of liberal Christianity to judge God in terms of God's usefulness, neglecting Divine holiness. Accordingly, he criticised the liberal tradition by arguing that here was a real danger of human manipulation if we conceived of religion as adjustment to a divine reality for the sake of self-interest. Therefore, a faith was required, Niebuhr thought, 'to abandon pretensions of power and adjustment' and rather, 'to hear a revelation that brought us judgment.' Alongside Niebuhr, Paul Tillich also stressed God's reality as a crisis in the human situation, suggesting that "God was not the supporter and preserver of human projections and ideals, but simply stood in judgment over every finite value."[34] In other words, for him, since God was the reality that resisted and transcended human control, every human effort that tried to get only control over mind, nature, and God, would be destined to fail. After the great financial panic of 1929, there emerged increasingly a rediscovery of the traditional Christian doctrine of sinfulness that the liberal theologians had very often neglected. Among those theological realists, the most prominent theologian was Reinhold Niebuhr, who showed how the persistent inclination to self-seeking is more potent and more mysterious than the natural impulses. He argued that in *Psychology of Adjustment* by J. Shafer "the self is reduced to the level of nature." However, he said "the real situation is that the human self is strongly inclined to seek its own but that it has a sufficient dimension of transcendence over self to be unable to ascribe this inclination merely to natural necessity. On the other hand, when it strives for a wider good it surreptitiously introduces its own interests into this more inclusive value."[35] Reinhold Niebuhr therefore described human sinfulness in this way "The human capacity of transcending self invariably produced anxiety and thus spawned a futile effort in all of us to secure our existence by making absolutes of mere relative and

finite values. At the heart of sinfulness, then, was idolatry, a trust in cultural values as if they embodied the divine."[36]

It may well be said that the earlier pastoral writers in the century had stressed that self-realization was in accordance with the highest and best values of culture. However it was clarified by the neo-orthodox theologians that every culture value stood under judgment. In fact, the pastoral clinical movement, according to the terminology of E.B. Holifield[37], was getting to shift the emphasis from adjustment to insight by the beginning of the Second World War. In other words, there was a growing notion of sinfulness as a false adaptation to the divine, and a conception of sin as a misuse of human freedom.

Furthermore, as the ideal of insight had superseded that of adjustment as a goal of Protestant pastoral care, pastoral care was increasingly coming to be viewed as individual counseling[38]. In this context Rollo May published *Art of Counselling* in 1939 became a fundamental textbook for a counselling model giving instruction into 'insight'.

2. THE DEVELOPMENT OF MODERN PASTORAL THEOLOGY

Pastoral Theology after the Second World War

Undoubtedly, the Second World War accelerated enormously the revival of interest in psychology again in the United States. Most companies and factories were glad to employ the psychologists who were leaving the army. Thus psychology was establishing itself as big business and as an essential means for personal success. In fact, a great number of people believed that their social standing and economic achievement required a shift from skills with things to skills with persons. An essential condition for success was a 'well-rounded personality'. One American journalist therefore commented that "the psychological preoccupation of the culture had made for a change comparable in the magnitude of its effect to the original American revolution."[39]

Most predictably, in this cultural context, Christian churches were greatly influenced by such popular culture. Hence, it was not surprising that popular psychology raised expectations of the minister's work in terms of pastoral counselling, and this became in part an important factor of the religious revival of the 1950s as well. Here, it is important to note that about 8,000 chaplains had participated in the Second World War, where "they attended the Army Chaplain's School at Harvard, which by 1944 had established a curriculum in pastoral care." Consequently, "when the war ended, a commission on the ministry sponsored their further instruction during the 1950s,

and then concluded that the experience of the chaplains had helped to make pastoral counselling a 'special part' of the work of the minister in postwar America."[40]

In these circumstances clinical pastoral educators had founded 117 regular centers for clinical pastoral training by the end of the 1950s, and obtained cooperation with more than 40 theological schools to offer clinical experiences for students. Thus an interdenominational commission on the ministry announced in 1955 that about 4,000 Protestant clergy had already been trained in clinical centres.[41]

This institutional development was one of the most important in the postwar period and the outcome of enormous energetic efforts for the theorising of pastoral practice. In 1949, Seward Hiltner published his *Pastoral Counselling*, and introduced an 'eductive method' that was similar to the client-centered methods of psychotherapy by Carl Rogers, stressing 'the creative potentialities of the person needing help'. He also argued that some counsellors assumed that emotional difficulties emerged out of inadequate 'adjustment' to the social order, but such an assumption risked subordinating persons to social conventions. Furthermore, although he recognised the practical importance of inner release, he felt that the notion should be set within a broader ethical vision, emphasising the 'creative dynamic forces' in human personality rather than the darker aspects of the unconscious. Carrol Wise, in his *Religion in Illness and Health* (1942) had already argued that the central function of religion was to develop a symbolic world-view that could aid in the integration and growth of the personality. Wise therefore contended that religious symbols offered a way for a person to express inner meaning and discover values and ideals, because he believed that the purpose of religion was to produce new and deeper integration of personality. In 1951, in *Pastoral Counselling*: Its Theory and Practice, he further demonstrated his idea of 'personalist theology, dynamic psychology and Rogerian theories of counselling.' Wayne Oates published *The Christian Pastor* (1951 and Rev.ed. 1964) in which he attempted to combine traditional Protestant language with a theory of 'psychosocial role behaviour' taken from the social sciences. In 1953, Paul Johnson came out with his *Psychology of Pastoral Care*, based on Rogerian methods, interpersonal psychiatry, and personalist theology.

Despite these pastoral theologians each representing a distinct theory and model, it was obvious that they shared common ground, namely, that they valued individual counselling and favoured the criticism of 'mass society and culture'. Meanwhile, they gradually began to distinguish pastoral counselling as a special form of pastoral care. As a result, pastoral care was coming to mean the broader range of pastoral duties, on the other hand, pastoral counselling came to refer to a more specific and professionalised activity based on psychological and psychotherapeutic knowledge.

Behind this new development of pastoral theology, as already observed, it is impossible to ignore one American psychologist, Carl Rogers, who for more than a decade between the 1950s and the 1960s exercised enormous influence on pastoral theologians. He was already known by his book *Counselling and Psychotherapy* (1942) in which he expounded 'non-directive therapy'. However, after he published his book *Client-Centered Therapy*: Its Current Practices, Implications, and Theory (1951), Roger's methods of 'client-centred' counselling became the dominant model for counselling skill among the clinical professions, and among Christian ministers as well. As for the reason why the Rogerian method could penetrate deeply through the pastoral ministry, one of the most decisive factors might be that his method seems to be relatively safe and easily applicable for a pastoral minister of limited training. For example, concerning the central idea of Rogerian therapy, he says in his major book *On Becoming a Person* (1961):

> If I can create a relationship characterized on my part: by a genuineness and transparency, in which I am my real feelings; by a warm acceptance of and prizing of the other person as a separate individual; by a sensitive ability to see his [*sic*] world and himself as he sees them; then the other individual in the relationship: will experience and understand aspects of himself which previously he has repressed; will find himself becoming better integrated[42].

Thus, a new metaphor of pastoral care was reflected in the writing of Rogers and came to prevail throughout pastoral counselling, that is, 'Acceptance'[43]. Alongside the Rogerian key concepts of non-directive/client centered therapy, clarification of feeling and empathic understanding, there was a growing emphasis on the minister's capacity to offer acceptance and facilitate 'self-acceptance'. According to the Rogerian theory, a climate of acceptance in counselling made it possible for a client to have temporary relief from rigid moral codes and alien institutional constraints, and the counsellor's non-judgmental or unlimited acceptance of unacceptable impulses in distressed persons could provide a way to their own self-acceptance and self-realisation. Rogers explained it as 'unconditional positive regard' which was the self-accepting of the counsellor in order to accept the client without reservation or evaluation. Therefore it was his conclusion that any coercive relationship in counselling was never more than superficially effective. Furthermore, he strongly suggested that the counsellor should not pay attention so much to the substance of what was said as to the feelings that were expressed, because the free release of the client's feelings and emotionalised attitudes in the accepting climate of the

counselling relationship would lead inevitably through new awareness to self-acceptance, and eventually to insight. In short, through the vehicle of emotional release insight would attain a new perception of the intricate interweaving of all the impulses within the self. For these reasons, he believed that "the counsellor, even if it required a temporary loss of the counsellor's own identity, should try to adopt the client's 'internal frame of reference' -that is, to see the world as the other person saw it, even to see the other person as if from that person's own perspective."[44]

At the same time, Rogers always pointed to social institutions and structures, because they were, he deemed, the source of the social evaluations that prevented self-acceptance. On this point, he was a man of consistent liberal views throughout his life, and he therefore tended to view social institutions as heterodox impositions on human freedom. He said that his distrust of social conventions was mainly due to his life history formed by resistance to religious conservatism including the moralistic legalism of his parents, and partly because his eyes were opened to a diversified world by his exposure to China during a trip as a student delegate in the World Student Christian Federation. Needless to say, later on, Rogers' stance on social institutions and structures was to be severely questioned, because his negative attitude toward social environments of human beings seemed to contribute to the *status quo* after all. In fact, due to the Rogerian psychotherapy, pastoral care undoubtedly tended to ignore historical and social context, so that it came to neglect the person's feelings and emotions caused by his/her external circumstances.

Nevertheless, Rogerian practical theory was generally accepted by most of the pastoral ministers, particularly by the religious liberals, because they disliked fundamentally every imposition which impeded self-realisation for growth and change, because it was 'openness' that they regarded as an essential ethic of Christian faith. For instance, a group of chaplain supervisors, committed to the principle of acceptance in counselling, demonstrated how much Protestant moral legalism caused emotional conflict and spiritual immaturity of patients and students, especially through the imposition of narrow and harsh moral judgments, negative views of sexuality and authoritarianism. Therefore acceptance or understanding gained an important nuance of meaning both in counselling and in pastoral care as an ethical attitude.

It should also be noted that the psychologists and social critics, at that time, also had an inclination to resist authoritarian or bureaucratic social institutions and order. For example, revisionist Feudian psychoanalysts such as Erich Fromm and Karen Horney proposed a humanistic psychology based on an ethic of self-realisation that aimed to free people from any oppressive power such as alien impositions on

selfhood.

Erich Fromm, in a series of books such as *The Sane Society* (1955) and *The Art of Loving* (1956), believed that within the 'pseudo self' (social forces imbued with social expectation and role-taking of social convention) there lay a deeper creative instinct and the potential for a real self capable of self-realisation through the spontaneous activity of the integrated personality. Karen Horney also advocated an ethic of self-realisation that distinguished between a true and a public self. According to her, the most sterile neurotic solution to anxiety was the self's creation of 'idealized image'. In other words, human beings unconsciously tend to compensate for their anxiety by creating an ideal image of themselves - the 'idealized self'. They tend to live in their own unlimited desire, exposing themselves to a threatening world. In this model there is a constant tension between the tyrannical demands of the ideal self and the actual self. Therefore, she suggested that the real self needs to be saved from the alienating situation for autonomous growth by the weakening of the pride system through psychotherapy.

However, we can hear again a strong warning voice of Reinhold Niebuhr who had been criticising the current psychotherapists for optimistic humanism and their insufficient awareness of the impulse toward selfishness. He stated in his *The Self and the Dramas of History* (1954) that "the most impressive modern psychological version of the Enlightenment theory of an essential harmless self-regard, which becomes harmful only when frustrated, is given by the Neo-Freudian Erich Fromm, in his *Man for Himself* (1947). He presents the thesis that men must first seek their own happiness, whereupon they may then love others as a 'phenomenon of abundance.' But Fromm does not see that the security of the self is furnished not by its own efforts at security, but by the love of others. There is no point at which the self, seeking its own, can feel itself self-satisfied and free to consider others than itself."[45] Niebuhr also criticised Karen Horney, writing "according to Miss Horney, human beings would grow naturally to fulfill their potentialities if the demand for the unconditioned and the perfect did not interfere with their nature. (But) the desire for the absolute, whether for power or perfection, is not introduced by any particular doctrine or religion, but grows up spontaneously in human nature and creates many effects in human relations, even when the impulse does not create the neuroses."[46] Thus, Niebuhr strongly rejected the naturalistic presuppositions of the modern psychological sciences that "the capacity to love presupposes a 'phenomenon of abundant self-love'" and that "the abundance of security which enables the self to love is derived from its previous self-seeking."[47] Thus, he argued for the importance of the paradoxical truth in Christian faith that self-realisation would be given through

self-denial.

In fact, it was not long before many ministers began to raise questions about the adequacy of humanistic psychology, and especially of Rogerian counselling. In short, for them the most crucial suspicion on this point was that they were much attracted by ideas countering the legalistic moral ethos and oppressive social institutions. However it was problematic to formulate the sharp dichotomy between a true self, seeking self-realisation and an inauthentic public self, oppressed by social and institutional expectations. Therefore, it was disputed what the basic aims of pastoral care should be, in other words, whether or not human growth should be intended to transform self-love into love for others, self-concern as egoism into an awakening self that shattered the narrow boundaries of the ego.

However when the debate between Rogers and Niebuhr reached its height, most of the pastoral theologians rather stood with Rogers, yet they also, during the 1960s, began to criticise the Rogerian style of counselling from several points of view. Clinebell and Johnson challenged the presuppositions of Rogerian counselling for being too individualistic. Similarly, Clinebell proposed in his *Basic Types of Pastoral Counseling* (1966) a 'relationship-centered counseling' aimed at enhancing a person's ability to form satisfying relationships with other people.[48] One of the most enthusiastic of the early proponents of Rogerian methods, P.E. Johnson also asserted that Rogers had wrongly espoused 'a capsule theory of personality' as something self-sufficient and self-contained.[49]

Hiltner came to warn of the tendency of pastoral theologians to seek a borrowed identity from psychotherapy, emphasized the importance of the church as the setting for pastoral care, and accentuated the distinction between pastoral care and pastoral counselling. Therefore, for the purpose of demonstrating pastoral theology as a theological discipline he restated pastoral theology as 'operation-centered' or 'function-centered' under the umbrella of a 'shepherding perspective' rather than the 'logic-centered' sphere in theological science.[50] Hiltner also proposed an eductive approach in which the initiative for the solution to the pastoral situation was based on the creative potentialities of the person needing help. Accordingly, without abandoning the ideal of acceptance, attention should be paid to the importance of confrontation and judgment in pastoral care.[51]

Nonetheless, Carrol Wise has argued that Rogers and Hiltner paid too much attention to the point of view of the counsellor and not enough to the 'interaction' between counsellor and client. Ministers could not separate their counselling from their 'general pastoral relationship', which helped define the very meaning of communication and response in pastoral work.[52]

Wayne Oates insisted that although the Rogerian insights were indispensable, the 'symbolic role of the pastor' as the representative of a specific community and tradition was the most decisive for pastoral work. Furthermore, though it was often wise to follow Rogers' advise and simply 'reflect feeling back to the person', he said ministers also should acknowledge certain broad objectives they were seeking to accomplish. They could therefore feel free to take more initiative in their counselling than Rogers would permit.[53]

However, as Philip Rieff pointed out, the so-called therapeutic paradigm continued to be dominant and 'triumphant' over other cultural modes for human problems, especially moral culture.[54] Therefore, while popular versions of self-fulfillment had been disseminated during the 1960s, highly professionalised pastoral counselling has increasingly developed and changed the scene of the pastoral ministry. Predictably, this new phenomenon evoked considerable controversy and disagreement among pastoral theologians. A few pastoral theologians began to re-emphasise the distinction between pastoral care - the whole range of pastoral activity aimed at guiding and sustaining a congregation, and counselling - a more narrowly defined relationship between a pastor and a person in need. Some argued that pastoral counselling was merely one dimension of pastoral care and that it made sense only within the context of the church. By 1961 a number of leaders in the pastoral care movement began to call for pastoral counselling specialists to work in counselling centres or even to carry on private pastoral practice. In 1963 a conference was held in New York City that resulted in the formation of the American Association of Pastoral Counsellors, a group designed primarily for specialists in pastoral counselling. However some of the pastoral theologians disagreed with the one-sided emphasis on counselling in the pastoral care movement. Particularly, both Seward Hiltner and Wayne Oates were exceedingly sceptical and critical of the new organization, arguing for the relationship of pastoral counselling to theology and to secular psychology, and in particular to issues about the adequacy of private pastoral practice.[55] For them, pastoral counselling was merely one function of the broader ministry of pastoral care within the church. Clinebell did believe, however, that this movement toward specialisation in pastoral counselling would uniquely contribute to the helping of troubled persons by stimulating their potentialities toward their spiritual growth.[56]

Thus, there arose much discussion about the nature of pastoral care. Should pastoral counselling be located solely within the church? Should there be pastoral counselling specialists who work in counselling centers or established private practice? What was the difference between pastoral counselling and psychotherapy? What is the difference between the psychiatric goal of mental health and the

theological goal of spriritual growth? Is health equated with salvation or not?
Very interestingly, these questions consequently provoked significant concern about the meaning of context for pastoral care, namely, a new awareness of pastoral care in terms of both ecclesiastical and social contexts. For example, if social formation of the self occurs through interpersonal relationships, the interpersonal or meta-personal dimensions of selfhood in pastoral care ought to receive the primary attention rather than the intra-personal. Another concern was that pastoral care and counselling should be located in the concrete institutional context of the church, although there was still some disagreement about it among the pastoral ministers.

Meanwhile, by the end of the sixties a counter-culture of the younger generation alienated by the Vietnam war started to search for a new consciousness that would create new possibilities for self-development. At the same time, the 1960s witnessed an enormous expansion in the number of small groups aimed at developing interpersonal relationships and therapeutic community.[57] Such small group movements were originally attributed to the Research Center for Group Dynamics in 1946 at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology, established by social psychologist Kurt Lewin. Lewin's social psychology was based on the so-called 'Field theory' which tried to understand human behaviour as a point of intersection in a field of interdependent forces. Hence, he insisted that the human person should be viewed as a unitary system in process, surrounded by a large field of continually altering systems and forces. Consequently he emphasised the interacting forces in human psychology rather than the internal state of an individual, or the past event of childhood. Lewin's idea led to the creation of the National Training Laboratories in Bethel, Maine, which founded training groups (T-groups) to train people in the skills needed to change institutions. It came to be known in the early 1960s as a new force in psychology, because the group centered approach that participated with interpersonal processes and relationships seemed to have some advantages over the one-to-one counselling.

However, as already mentioned, by the end of sixties increasingly harsh questions were being asked of the pastoral care movement. It was largely because the pastoral care movement had primarily developed within 'the model of pastor to person relationship', and within health and welfare institutions. Thus, a leading pastoral theologian, Charles V. Gerkin suggested that if "theology can best be learned in the arena of central crisis of our age, and that new creative constructive solutions are possible from conflict and crisis, then we ought to have CPE centers in some new places." Furthermore, he pointed to a historical example of the Keller's summer school whose a practical method such as case work approach was being used in the

context of a more socially involved ministry.[58] In this vein, a few pastoral theologians began to rethink the framework of pastoral care, and then insist on the 'community-oriented model' or something called 'ministry to structures' in pastoral ministry.[59]

3. NEW DIRECTIONS OF MODERN PASTORAL THEOLOGY

(1) Black Civil Rights and Black Liberation Movements: From 'Civil Disobedience' to 'Liberation'

In the 1950s and 1960s, the civil rights movement under the strong leadership of Martin Luther King, Jr. and other black church persons emerged out of the long history of black struggle for racial justice in American society. It soon became a most influential event for American people, and pushed them to acknowledge that they needed to do something for social transformation. For black people, it was a *'Kairos'* occasion, telling that the time had come when they must stand up for themselves to change the social structures that blocked them from full participation in American society at all levels. Therefore, the movement had undoubtedly become a social and cultural revolution against the dominant societal norms and customs that had controlled and manipulated black people for a long time by setting unjust boundaries for human relationships.

Contrary to popular opinion, however, it is quite important to be reminded here, when King inaugurated the civil rights movement with the Montgomery bus boycott in 1955, the white American church could not admit the legitimacy of this movement. It is increasingly apparent now that the great majority of the white American Church, including the theologians, did not fully accept King's message that he was trying to interpret the Christian Gospel from the viewpoint of the black struggle for justice and liberation.[60] However, in spite of such negative circumstances, as Charles Gerkin pointed out, the civil rights movement had unmasked dramatically 'the hypocrisy beneath much of popular Christian setting of norms for human relationships'[61] that many churches were uncritically holding on to white exclusionism.

Therefore, it is not surprising that the civil rights movement gradually came radically to challenge traditional Christian ministry which had tended to minimise how social structures affect human relationships or individuals in social contexts. In fact, as we already observed in the previous section, pastoral theology in those days particularly had stressed the importance of adjustment, self-acceptance and personal insight informed by modern psychology. It was just in such a social and cultural climate that M.L. King started the movement of civil disobedience against the American democratic and constitutional situation. On this subject, King said:

> Modern psychology has a word that is probably used more than any other word. It is the word 'maladjusted'. Now we all should seek to live a well-adjusted life in order to avoid neurotic and schizophrenic personalities. But there are some things within our social order to which I am proud to be maladjusted and to which I call upon you to be maladjusted. I never intend to adjust myself to segregation and discrimination. I never intend to adjust myself to mob rule. I call upon you to be maladjusted to such things. There are some things in our social system to which all of us ought to be maladjusted. It may be that the salvation of the world lies in the hands of the maladjusted.[62]

For King the aim of the movement was not simply to combat injustices in the society any longer but to combat society itself. Thus, he advocated a new ideal of racial integration that black people would liberate themselves from the unreasonable pressures of bitterness and feeling of inferiority toward white people, and white people would liberate themselves from the pangs of conscience and feeling of superiority as well. Thus, up to the mid-1960s King had believed, partly because of his relation to the Social Gospel tradition, that American society might be able to reform itself through legislation prohibiting discrimination and guaranteeing voting rights. However, he gradually came to acknowledge seriously the ineffectiveness of legislation and started rethinking how deeply the racial issue links to social and economic issues in American society. In fact, "despite the passage of the civil rights acts of 1957,1960 and 1964, and the Voting rights Act of 1965,the myth of the decade of Negro [*sic*] progress applied only to a minute sector of the black community. In particular, the black poor - the overwhelming majority - languished in poverty and lack of significant social gains."[63] Thus, by about 1967 King clearly recognised 'the connections between the failure of the war on poverty and the expenditures for the war of Vietnam', and he proclaimed God's judgment against America and insisted that "God would break the three great evils of our time - war, racism, and poverty."[64] According to the witness of Gayraud S. Wilmore, in those days King was sorely troubled over the agony and predicament of young black radicals.[65] The point seemed to be whether or not the social structures could deliver racial integration through the vision of harmonising society and the strategy of non-violence in such a racist controlled environment. Meanwhile, a growing group of black ministers who had followed King began to openly question King's central ideas of love, integration, and nonviolence and then came to a fork in the road between King's philosophy of nonviolence and the so-called Black power[66], Malcolm X's nationalist philosophy.[67]

They were gradually moving their strategic vision from integration to separation, specially, from Martin Luther King to Malcolm X. In particular, King's assassination on April 4 1968 marked "a turning point in the political consciousness of many black Americans regarding nonviolence as a method for social change and as an expression of Christian love."[68] That is to say, although there were many black people who were reluctant to accept black power in that it implied a rejection of King's thought, Black power now came to be part of the mainstream in the black community and a real choice for the black movement. What does 'Black Power' mean? "It means, says Black liberation theologian James Cone, complete emancipation of black people from white oppression by whatever means black people deem necessary. The methods may include selective buying, boycotting, marching or even rebellion"[69]. Hence, as a matter of course, this dramatic change of black consciousness and behaviour made a great impact on both the course of black politics and the white society at large. The term 'liberation' now became the dominant theme in black power movement, and justice, love, hope and suffering were understood in the light of full political implications.

Thus, it may well be said that the black power movement of liberation, by uniting with King's Christian gospel, gave birth to black liberation theology in the midst of the black struggle for racial justice. Accordingly, it is rightly said, according to Cone's view, that although King rejected Black Power in his lifetime, "the existence of Black Power is a result of his work. Black power advocates are men [*sic*] who were inspired by his zeal for freedom, and Black Power is their attempt to make his dream a reality."[70]

As discussed above, the civil rights' and black power' movements unquestionably unmasked the fact that unjust social structures and the oppressive environment were major factors, creating hardships which thwart and destroy human lives. Similarly, it was becoming acknowledged that oppression-imbued economic, social and political exploitation led to deprivation of their value system and identity distortion of the black people's minds and emotions. In short, as W.E.B. Dubois commented on looking at one's self through the eyes of others (double consciousness)[71], "to be oppressed is to be defined, located or set aside according to another's perspective."[72]

On this point, more than any other leading figure in the late 1950s and early 1960s, Malcom X noticed the profound implication of psychological self-hatred and self-denigration internalised by black people. He always insisted, "The worst crime the white man has committed has been to teach us to hate ourselves."[73]

For that matter, most noteworthily, in the late 1960s and early 1970s several black psychiatrists published studies based on their clinical work with black patients which

tried to see black behavior and mental processes from the viewpoint of both black life-experiences and his/her social environment.[74] They examined that "in many instances mental illnesses are directly traceable to internalised frustration and rage induced by the effects of racism and oppression in the environment." Accordingly, they remarked:

> One of the problems in understanding the discontent of black people in America is highlighted in this material. The relationship between intra-psychic functioning and the larger social environment is exceedingly complex. Among other things, Negroes [*sic*] want to change inside but find it difficult to do so unless things outside are changed as well.[75]

Furthermore, they came to the conclusion that if Christian religion persists in being shaped by white norms and values, and the period of enduring slavery continues to regard blackness as a symbol of that which is innately inferior and evil, black people will continue to depreciate their own dignity, and will hinder their healthy self-affirmation.[76] Therefore, the most crucial task of Christian religion to be undertaken here was to re-examine itself from the issue of racial prejudice, and to reframe itself to counteract the negative, guilt-producing bias of such a white religion.

Indeed, in this context the black liberation movement in the 1960s and 1970s evoked undoubtedly a revolutionary implication for black consciousness and identity against white racism so that black people could redeem their self-worth as human persons in the struggle of negative stereotypes, racial and oppressive policies, and economic disadvantages.

However, predictably, it is utterly impossible to discover any evidence that pastoral theology could face up to the needs of these times. In short, this is because it held the assumption that social adjustment was the solution to everyone's problems. Hence, pastoral theology has taken it for granted that even if black people had varied cultural backgrounds, they were to be acculturated or assimilated into the dominant class values. There was no consideration of the unique cultural heritage of minority people. In these circumstances, J. Cone cried out:

> It is not that the black man is absurd or that the white society as such is absurd. Absurdity arises as the black man seeks to understand his place in the white world. The black man does not view himself as human. But as he meets the white world and its values, he is confronted with an almighty No and is defined as a thing. This produces the absurdity.[77]

Pastoral Theology in the Black Struggle for Racial Justice

As discussed above, these were rather disillusioning times during the civil rights movement and succeeding decades. American society had encountered an enormous demand of social change, this implied a need for re-examination of American traditional norms and a vision for a free America as expressed in the republic constitution.

However, from the viewpoint of the development of pastoral theology, even if there were undoubtedly many discussions and efforts to respond to social issues, unexpectedly, in fact, hardly any fruitful achievements could be observed which were related to the wider social context and which could integrate care of persons with care of the social environment. Needless to say, although there might have been a great expectation that pastoral care could contribute to social change as well as personal-individual welfare, as a matter of fact, it seemed to be still absorbed in individual counselling and interpersonal relationships. Accordingly, Elaine L. Graham, explaining why pastoral care came to show such a tendency, critiques that "there seemed to be headlong rush for social acceptance as qualified health care professionals. In spite of a few writings from professors and others in the field, matters of theology, ethics, and social change were seriously marginalised by clinical specialists in pastoral care and counselling."[78]

However, my focus is concern for the main issues that the black civil rights and black power movements have raised for pastoral theology. There are perhaps at least four essential impacts on pastoral theology.

(a) First, it has been definitely shown by these movements that pastoral theology must develop an integrated perspective between social environment and personal-individual life. Particularly, it has to grasp the psychological aspect and the meaning of the individual self in the perspective of social context. For instance, there exist the serious problems of ideological biases operating upon society explicitly and implicitly that regard the black personality as pathological and deviant. Accordingly, pastoral theology ought first to examine and recognise the ideological biases in its theory and praxis, and moreover, it needs to have a proper understanding of social forces operating on the human personality and the varied cultural backgrounds of human lives. Particularly, the pervasive influence of racism on the black personality has been evidenced in the black person's belief that "he [or she] does not possess the power to effect change in his [or her] life and in the lives of others - indeed, that he [or she] is powerless."[79] More importantly, the feeling of powerlessness has a close connection with the feeling of anger. In other words, "Since the avenues available to Whites are

not so readily available to Blacks in expressing their anger, the rage is often turned inward."[80] This suppression of anger has resulted in many psychological and mental problems, such as feeling of self-hatred, low self-esteem, guilt, apathy and disoriented personality. Therefore, it is absolutely true that we need to be aware of the environmental factors and, specifically, the realities of racism which have shaped the lives of black persons. For this matter, it is an essential for pastoral theology "to read the signs of times to discover what God is doing with individuals trapped in the misery of personal sins, and communities trapped in worldly structures."[81]

(b) Secondly, the civil rights movement certainly made black people aware that their lives had not merely been manipulated by external factors, but also to some extent internally controlled. This new awareness immediately led them to reappraise their own cultural richness and uniqueness as black people and community, and to rediscover the resources and heritages inherent in their community. Particularly, the black community and Church came to acknowledge the incredible value of black families and extended families which resist assimilation into the wider white society and affirm the positive aspects of their life and living that had been underestimated by the dominant culture.[82] In other words, their families have been historically the most important shelters to support and foster personhood and the personal integrity of black people, in harsh, negative circumstances.

Therefore, pastoral care needs to transform such social structures and cultural value systems that stifle black identity, dignity and self-expression, and also is to build up the black cultural tradition, especially collective identity.

In fact, Edward P. Wimberly suggests that Black American pastoral care has recently been influenced by a perspective called 'cultural variant model' which can be used to understand individual and corporate behavior and life from within the black community context. In short, it can be explained that this model is an attempt to "counteract the cultural deviant and pathological models that exist and describe black culture as an inferior divergence from white middle-class culture."[83] In any case, the most vital clue to appropriate pastoral practices will lie in how to assist the oppressed black people to affirm their identity against vicious and negative social forces.

(c) Third, if pastoral theology is regarded not simply as the practice of theology but primarily as the theology of practice, it will shift its focus from application of doctrine in pastoral situations to 'action-reflection'. It may well be called to critical hermeneutics in a dialogue between theology and praxis. At this point, one of the most important contributions of black theology to pastoral theology is to clarify the captivity of theology to ideological biases. Simultaneously, it could present a

theological understanding that "Christian theology is never just a rational study of the being God. Rather, it is a study of God's liberating activity in the world, his activity on behalf of the oppressed."[84] Furthermore, these opinions were radically strengthened by the suspicion of the 'universal tone' of Christian theology, that is, that theology lies rather in the particular experiences of oppressed people as the starting point for an understanding of God's activity in the world. Cone therefore states as below:

> Black theology is suspicious of people who appeal to a universal, ideal humanity. The oppressors are ardent lovers of humanity. They can love all men in general, even black people, because intellectually they can put black people in the category called Humanity. The basic mistake of our white opponents is their failure to see that God did not become a universal man but an oppressed Jew, thereby disclosing to us that both man's nature and God's are inseparable from oppression and liberation.[85]

Surely, it is true that pastoral theology serves a particular situation, what Anton Boisen once called a 'clinical' situation, where a human person is in trouble, suffering and a crisis is whether pastoral theology truly equipped to participate in the wider historical context of the liberating desires and activities of oppressed peoples, as well as in a concrete reality of personal suffering.

Hence, Edward P. Wimberly, who is a pioneer in the field of Black [African] American pastoral theology, seeks to find a possibility of developing 'the growth counselling model' as a new pastoral practice in African American Church. This model was originally proposed in the pastoral theology of Howard Clinebell as a human wholeness approach to the helping process. Its basic goal is 'the liberation of the potentialities of persons in all dimensions of their lives, beginning with inner liberation.'[86] In short, it aims to facilitate the maximum development of a person's full possibilities at each stage of the life cycle in ways that enable the growth of others and contributes as well to the development of society. Wimberly highly values this growth-oriented model because "it emphasises growth-health systems values in contrast to individualistic, hierarchical, pathological, and medical orientations."[87] Thus, pastoral care through practicing this model, can be committed to the ways of focusing on human liberation in a person's strengths rather than weaknesses, together with the importance of the social network of systems for caring and the significance of the black community. This model recognises how personality growth is influenced by unjust social structures and negative social ethos, and in contrast, how

a person's struggle against injustice leads to positive personality growth. More recently, Wimberly took another step in his new book, *African American Pastoral Care*, in which he suggests the significant value of a narrative style of pastoral care in the black church. He explains why this narrative approach is effective, namely, it is because as King had been inspired by uniting his own experiences with the biblical revelation, it is exceedingly easy for black people to identify their black experiences of oppression with God's self-disclosure in a historical story of liberation. Therefore, Wimberly believes that a narrative approach is unquestionably important for black pastoral care. It will achieve personal and social transformation, because "the unfolding story of God's rule and reign is characterised by God's ongoing activity to bring all dimensions of the world under God's leadership and story for the purposes of liberation, healing, and wholeness."[88]

(d) Fourth, what is the most lasting significance of black movements for racial justice? Presumably it should be mentioned that they ignited indirectly or directly the affirmative actions of other disadvantaged people and victims in American society. Therefore, Charles V. Gerkin commented:

> [N]o form of Christian presence in the contemporary world has had a greater transforming impact on American culture than has the presence of the black church. Because of its provision of a living, and unmistakably liberating, communal voice for justice and equity that refused not to be heard, the black church initiated a process of transformation within the society that is yet to realize its full potential.[89]

Thus, the powerful impact of the black civil rights movement became increasingly clear as one of the signs of changing human relationship norms. The feminist movement first emerged in the 1960s out of the Black civil rights movement. In fact, "the revisions in the cultural infrastructure beneath many of the foundational customs of Western social life being initiated by feminists were far more radical than those demanded by civil rights activists."[90] Consequently, the feminist movement gradually developed into a joining together with other marginalised people to denounce the injustice of social situation. Accordingly, it is important here to say that the feminist and other movements of the marginalised and ethnic minorities did not only insist on their rights, but more fundamentally and thoroughly, questioned the whole social structure and cultural value based on discrimination and domination.

Thus, the long-standing injustice and oppression hidden in the history of American society became increasingly uncovered. Widely held beliefs based on white male

dominance, particularly the patriarchal system, and paternalism was harshly challenged. Furthermore, in 1976 an organisation called 'Theology in the Americas', which is constituted of oppressed Black, Native American, Hispanic, and Asian Christian began to consult regarding their common plight of oppression.[91]
As a result, it is becoming central issue to build awareness of mutual accountability through the development of these movements, that is, it is concerned with "the significance of seeing race, class, and gender as interlocking systems of oppression."[92]

(2) The New Directions of Modern Pastoral Theology

Pastoral theology in the Roman Catholic Church after The Second Vatican Council

Here, we must not ignore a new powerful impetus to pastoral theology, a new great impact on the pastoral care movement, which has been provided by the Roman Catholic Church. Pastoral care in the Roman Catholic tradition has usually continued to be exercised as priestly sacramental ministry which was mainly composed of the administration of the sacraments and spiritual direction, that is, its focus was laid almost exclusively on the work of the priest. However, though the Second Vatican Council did not directly give any particular guidance on pastoral theology, it unquestionably brought new theological understandings of mission, and the relationship between Church and society. For example, the Council declares the mission of the Church to be as follows:

> Christ's redemptive work, while of itself directed toward the salvation of men, involves also the renewal of the whole temporal order. Hence the mission of the Church is not only to bring men to the message and grace of Christ, but also to penetrate and perfect the temporal sphere with the spirit of the Gospel. In fulfilling this mission of the Church, the laity therefore exercise their apostolate both in the Church and in the world, in both the spiritual and temporal order.[93]

Therefore, in this wider context of Christian Mission the Council gave a new spirit and insight to pastoral ministry. Especially, it revealed a strong accent on the non-hierarchical understanding of ecclesiology and a dramatic shift of attitude concerning the modern world from suspicion and hostility to respect and reciprocity. In other words, Christian mission ought to be understood by all believers as members of the Christian community (the lay apostolate) and the Church must bring the gospel into modern society, through the 'duty of scrutinizing the signs of the times and of interpreting them in the light of the Gospel.'[94]

In this vein, pastoral theologians, such as Henri Nouwen, from around the seventies, demonstrated a new style of pastoral theology which reflected both the spirit of the Second Vatican and pastoral psychology, and have been well accepted by a wide audience.

The Current Issues of Pastoral Theology

Looking back briefly on the development of pastoral theology since the Second World War, it can be said that by the middle of the 1960s pastoral theology was largely under the tremendous influences of secular psychology and counselling. Although there were various differences in their emphases, Hiltner, Oates, Johnson and Wise had tried to develop their own pastoral theologies in the framework of Freudian psychoanalysis and Rogerian humanistic psychology.

Pastoral Counseling (1949) written by Hiltner was the most representative achievement in this period. The second period from the late of 1960s was characterised by much criticism of Freud and Rogers and instead, much favour was shown to behaviour therapy. Clinebell's *Basic Types of Pastoral Counseling* (1966) became a standard book for pastoral counselling based on various behaviour therapies.

As already discussed, from the end of the 1960s, there arose many controversies about the nature of pastoral care and theology. However, it may well be said that these investigations could scarcely produce concrete results. In short, there was a slight blank in the development of pastoral theology during the seventies. Shortly after the end of the seventies, however, several pastoral theologians began to initiate new understandings of pastoral theology, particularly stressing the theological implications of pastoral theology. There are of course different directions and motivations among them, but they have shared a common acknowledgement of growing crisis in the contemporary climate of pastoral care and counselling. That is to say, they have contended that pastoral care uncritically borrows from insights and techniques of secular humanistic psychotherapy and psychology, and consequently, it has a weak theological foundation. In general, there are the four current issues that the several representative pastoral theologians have newly investigated.

(a) Recovering the historical and theological tradition as essential resources

As discussed earlier, one of the most obvious contentions in modern pastoral theology is that it has depended too much upon secular psychologies so that pastoral care has lost its theological concern, or has left it on the periphery. Although Thomas Oden was one of the most zeal advocates of Rogerian psychology and counselling by the 1960s, he now turned to become a major opinion leader of those who claim that

the historical and traditional wisdom in Christianity should be a strong central resources for pastoral care. Oden therefore concludes in his book *Care of Souls in the Classic Tradition* (1984) that traditional Christian wisdom is practical and relevant to contemporary pastoral work and teaching. Particularly, in an inquiry into the authentic pastoral identity, he strongly stresses the importance and effectiveness of Gregory the Great for contemporary pastoral needs, as showed in his thought on the art of pastoral governance such as care for the poor and pastoral admonition.[95] While he contended that the modern pastoral care movement was 'amnesiac' of the classic tradition, Oden published his own Pastoral theology: *Essentials of Ministry* (1983) in which he defined pastoral theology as 'the branch of Christian theology that deals with the office and function of the pastor.'[96] Thus, pastoral theology is placed within the larger context of practical theology which refers to the whole church's ministry. Hence, pastoral theology is almost identified with practical theology, and becomes a comprehensive discipline that integrates all the functions of ordained ministry, such as liturgical leadership, preaching, teaching, sacramental ministry, administrating and pastoral caring. However, Oden's proposal raises several questions, such as his narrow definition of pastoral ministry as ordained ministry (the so called 'clerical paradigm') and his equivocal understanding of the relationship between modern psychology and his theories of pastoral care.

(b) Reconstructing pastoral care within ethical/moral context:

"[T]he pastoral care of the Christian churches needs to be understood within the context of the tradition of practical moral rationality typical of ancient Judaism, especially as this developed in later Pharisaic and rabbinical movements .Without recognizing this contextual background, both Christianity and the care that it extends can become normless antinominanism."[97] Don Browning, in his the *Moral Context of Pastoral Care* (1976), has significantly insisted on recovering the moral context of pastoral care, emphasising that "care in a Christian context should exhibit a kind of practical moral inquiry into the way life should be ordered."[98] Historically, as Browning pointed out, Christian care has clearly had two distinctive functions: one is the socialisation of members into the basic norms, patterns, and values of the Christian community, and the other is to help persons to cope with immediate personal crises and conflicts. However, the contemporary Churches, especially those of mainline Protestantism, have largely abandoned the first function and in contrast favored the second. He criticises recent pastoral care, illustrating the educative model (Hiltner), because "pastoral care and counselling have, for the most part, abandoned the task of moral guidance. It has centered its activity on counselling, the analysis and correction of the emotional dynamics of troubled persons."[99] Thus, Browning

believes that the Judeo-Christian theological tradition has provided the fundamental framework of practical moral thinking, because of its practical rationality, namely, inner-worldly asceticism (Max Weber), and it can be most highly relevant for the task of 'world construction' - building a moral world - in a time of cultural pluralism and value confusion. Therefore, Browning maintains in agreement with James M. Gustafson's thought, that the Church must seek to be a community of moral discourse and action that can contribute to building an ethical vision against the disintegration of the value framework of the individual and the larger society.

Browning's concern for ethics in pastoral theology is more concretely developed in his subsequent book *Religious Ethics and Pastoral Care* (1983), in which he presents five hierarchical levels of practical moral thinking: metaphorical, obligational, tendency-need, contextual-predictive, and rule-role.[100] Furthermore, he adds to the five levels of practical moral thinking four steps to practical theological action: experiencing and defining the problem, attention/listening/understanding, critical analysis/comparison, and decision/strategy.[101] In doing so, he is attempting to clarify the process from diagnosis and decision to practical action. Browning, as observed in his recent book *A fundamental Practical Theology* (1991), tries to reconstruct practical theology as a discipline of 'practical wisdom', shifting its focus from practice to theory.

Considering his arguments, we may raise two basic questions, namely, in his view there is rarely a consistent and integrated scheme between the practical and rational duties of daily moral rules, and the task of world construction. Second, although he is clearly a dialectician, it seems that he gives a rather unbalanced emphasis on the imperative, in other words, it is not clear how to integrate the imperative into the indicative in the light of the Gospel, as did the theology of D. Bonhoeffer.

(c) Exploring the Hermeneutical Model of Pastoral Theology

Arguably, the leading figure in this field, Donald Capps, has inquired into the theological perspectives of pastoral care in the use of the Bible and hermeneutical methods. In his Pastoral Care, *A Thematic Approach* (1979), he first noticed the theological significance of psychosocial developmental theory that E.H. Erikson proposed as 'the schedule of virtues' in the eight stages of personal growth. In other words, he remarked on the relation of eight theological concepts: providence, grace, repentance, calling, faith, fellowship, vocation and holiness, to Erikson's socio-psychological development theory of personality.[102] In his next book *Pastoral Counseling and Preaching* (1980), he clarified that "preaching and pastoral counseling need not be antithetical to each other," instead, "they can be two foci of an integrated ministry." Hereupon, he insists, as did Edward Thurneysen[103], that it is when

listening and speaking is understood complementarily that ministry can become most effective. He continues further discussion in *Biblical Approaches to Pastoral Counseling* (1981), in which he proves that the Bible can be a direct resource for counselling. More precisely, he explores three biblical writings: Psalms, Proverbs, and Parables, how they can be used in each different counseling situation: grief, premarital and marriage counselling. As indicated earlier, Capps sees Erik Erikson as the most evocative theorist for his theological conceptualisation of pastoral theology, and investigates again thoroughly the implications of Erikson's theories. This time, he specially focuses on the 'later' Erikson in 1960s when he discussed virtues and ritualisation to complement his life cycle theory. He correlates Erikson's theory of virtues the Christian classic list of 'deadly vices,'[104] and Erikson's theory of ritualisation with ritualised customs of the everyday Church life.[105] In doing so, he points out the importance of three major roles of pastor: moral counsellor, ritual coordinator, and personal comforter, and furthermore, he proposes a new pastoral care model for the three pastoral roles, that is, 'therapeutic wisdom', based on the biblical wisdom tradition-especially Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, and Job.[106] As already noticed, Capps's primary concern is how to integrate modern psychology with traditional pastoral practices and functions. Thus, in his attempt to investigate the hermeneutical model of pastoral theology, he came to realise that there are similarities between interpreting texts and interpreting human action. Therefore, he says in his *Pastoral Care and Hermeneutics* (1984), that "a hermeneutical model that seeks to gain insight into the meaning of such pastoral actions needs to address itself to these factors: (1) identifying the basic dynamic of pastoral action; (2) making a diagnostic assessment of the action; and (3) determining whether and in what ways the action is disclosive."[107] Furthermore, as a conceptual schema for interpreting pastoral action, he presents three models of theological diagnosis: contextual, experiential, and revisionist, and these models are each to correspond to three pastoral modalities: shepherd, wounded healer, and wise fool.[108] He suggests these modalities or metaphors can lead pastoral action to a real perception of what is going on in the situations in which care is needed.

Here we must not omit another leading person, Charles V.Gerkin who also has consistently pursued the hermeneutical perspective of pastoral theology. Whereas Capps seeks to reframe pastoral care within the context of the traditional Church, Gerkin has been interested in the hermeneutical perspective in order to transform pastoral practice in a dialogue between theology and contemporary psychology, and Christian tradition and the contemporary socio-cultural situation.

In *Crisis Experience on Modern Life* (1979), Gerkin has illuminated the religious

meaning of crisis experiences, such as death, the generation gap, and divorce which a pastor encounters in ordinary pastoral practices. Like Capps, he also understands life as a process of the interpretation of experience. Persons in crisis, therefore, can be seen as caught between a hermeneutic of despair and a hermeneutic of hope and expectation. Here lies the essential nature of crisis which means a loss of the sense of continuity. Thus, he restores a theology of providence: God's continuing activity on behalf of human beings, which can provide a hermeneutical key for understanding and making sense of everyday reality. According to Gerkin, persons in modern life can realise the providence of God through facing their own finitude and frailty in the crisis experiences. *The Living Human Document* (1984) is focused on the famous Anton Boisen's legacy, namely, 'living human document' as his expression of the hermeneutical perspective. Gerkin then proposes 'hermeneutical pastoral counselling' which is based on Hans-Georg Gadamer's concept of 'the fusion of horizons of understanding.'[109] That is to say, pastoral counselling is seen as a metaphorical interaction in a 'dialogical hermeneutical process between the pastoral counsellor as the representative of Christian interpretation and the counsellee as the interpreter of self-experience.' Hereupon, he emphasises the extreme importance of self-story to enter the metaphorical world of the trouble person, explaining 'the hermeneutics of the self in the life of the soul' as a three-dimensional entity: the self, the ego, and the soul in theological terms.[110] Drawing upon the Gadamerian hermeneutical method, in *Widening the Horizons* (1986) and *Prophetic Pastoral Practice* (1991) Gerkin further develops his hermeneutical pastoral perspective as a 'fusion of horizons' of the Christian story and the human story. He now suggests that pastoral practice must be rightly concerned with the transformation of common sense in the radically pluralistic situation of America: the cultural fragmentation of which has led to a loss of direction and unity concerning values and normative practices. For that reason, he tries to reframe the Church's ministry, into 'the model of narrative hermeneutical practical theology' or 'a metaphorical, narrative pastoral theology'.[111] At this point, as mentioned above, Capps appears largely to favour the biblical wisdom tradition, but Gerkin emphasises the prophetic tradition in his hermeneutical approach. However, why does he strongly insist on 'interpretative pastoral practice'? I would suggest it comes from his basic belief that ordinary persons neither live primarily by the rule of reason nor make their decisions by logical arguments, but live and do metaphorically.[112] Therefore, pastoral work is formulated as a metaphorical interaction or a dialogical relationship between the issue involved in the particular human situation and the 'the core metaphorical values and meaning of the Christian story.' Accordingly, he maintains that responsible pastoral practice first of all needs

radically to re-examine its metaphorical implication and its setting in community, Christian presence, and vocation to become the prophetic ministry (Walter Brueggemann).[113]

(d) Revising Pastoral Theology in terms of social location

At the risk of oversimplification, I would suggest that modern American pastoral theology has been foundationally rooted in a white-male-liberal-protestant-clergy movement.[114] As noted in the previous section, this narrowness of pastoral theology has severely come into question from around 1970s. Among capable critics of this theological tendency, Rebecca S. Chopp has tried to combine liberation theology and pastoral theology in a new theological integration.[115] Drawing some similarities and differences from both theologies, in her monograph *Liberation Theology and Pastoral Theology* (1990) she explores the common ground for a basic theological framework. It is true, she says, that there are many points of tension between them, especially in images of God, views of humanity and notions about sin. Nonetheless both theologies firmly have some common concerns with concrete human realities, such as suffering, denial, and hope. More importantly, both theological movements primarily have focused on human reality of being rooted in a particular and concrete situation of suffering, and also transforming action for situations toward new life through action-reflection practical method. Therefore, Chopp now proposes a new theology of culture focused upon the issue of self and society, particularly in the context of a global village.[116]

Here, we should refer to another socially conscious pastoral theologian. It is James Newton Poling who published *The Abuse of Power* (1991) and *Deliver Us from Evil* (1996). His unique approach to doing theology is to take his departure from a particular situation of personal and social evil. In The Abuse of Power he investigates the issue of the abuse of power, through listening to the survivors of sexual violence toward women and children, and then in Deliver Us From Evil, focuses on racial and gender oppression, concentrating his attention on the experiences of African American women. His theological approach always starts from a particular issue and situation with a perspective of social structures and systems that produce a variety of evils, including religious institutions and ideologies. From his recent analyses of the abuse of power and the violence of dominance, he strongly emphasises his conclusion, that the essential and urgent need for pastoral theology is to realise and strengthen the mutual accountability for struggling against the three major systems of oppression: race, class and gender.[117]Accordingly, it may well be said that here has started a new departure in pastoral theology appropriately addressed to both the personal and the social.

[1] John H. Westerhoff, *Will our children have faith?* pp. 27-28.
[2] E. Brooks Holifield, *A History of Pastoral Care in America*, p.202.
[3] William James, 'Remedial Religion', William A. Clebsh and Charles R. Jaekle, *Pastoral Care in Historical Perspective*, pp.321-335.
[4] William James, 'The Moral Equivalent of War and Other Essays', W. A. Clebsh and C. R. Jaekle, Ibid., pp.204-205.
[5] Robert C. Powell, *CPE-50 Years Learning Through Supervised Encounter With Living Human Documents*, p.4.
[6] Edward E. Thornton, *Professional Education for Ministry*, p.35.
[7] Holifield, op.cit.,p.230.
[8] Ibid., p.223.
[9] Ibid., p.210.
[10] Ibid., pp.215-216.
[11] Powell, op.cit., p.5 and p.15.
[12] Thornton, op.cit., p.40.
[13] Ibid., p.45.
[14] Powell, op.cit., pp.22-23.
[15] Quoted in Thornton, op.cit., p.48.
[16] Rodney J. Hunter (edit.), *Dictionary of Pastoral Care and Counseling*, p. 847.
[17] Cf. Anton T. Boisen, *The Exploration of the Inner World*, pp. 1-11. Paul E. Johnson, *Personality and Religion*, chapter 11.
[18] Holifield, op.cit., p.245.
[19] quoted in Powell, op.cit., p.9.
[20] Thornton, op.cit., p.61 and 65.
[21] Ibid., p.50.
[22] Ibid., p.63.
[23] Holifield, op.cit., p.244.
[24] The association defined the Clinical Pastoral Education:
It has its roots in the efforts of pioneers who sought to bring the theological students into supervised encounter with man in crisis in order that 'living human documents' might be studied, that the shepherding task of the ministry might be experienced, and that scientific knowledge of human relationships correlated with theological insights might be brought to bear on the pastoral task, in Constitution and By-Laws, the Association for Clinical Pastoral Education, Inc., 1967.
[25] Holifield, op.cit., p.234.
[26] Thornton, op.cit., p.51.
[27] Ibid., p.81 and 100.
[28] Powell, op.cit., p.13.
[29] Holifield, op.cit., p.236.
[30] Ibid., p.243.
[31] Ibid., p.247.
[32] Ibid., p.248.
[33] Thornton, op.cit.,p.108.
[34] Ibid., p.250.
[35] Reihold Niebuhr, *Faith and History*, pp.92-94.
[36] Quoted in Holifield, op.cit., p.256.
[37] Ibid., p.211.
[38] Ibid., p.259.
[39] Ibid., p.266.
[40] Ibid., p.269-270.
[41] Ibid., p.271.
[42] Carl R. Rogers, *On Becoming a Person*, pp.37-38.
[43] Presumably, at this point, it was Tillich who was most influential with the

American pastoral theologians. Relating psychological concepts to theological tradition, he proclaimed that the doctrine of justication by grace through faith now translated into 'power of acceptance'.
Cf. Paul Tillich, *The Shaking of the Foundation* and *The Courage to Be.*

[44] Holifield, op.cit., p.296.
[45] Reihold Niebuhr, *The Self and Dramas of History*, pp.154-155.
[46] Ibid., p.156.
[47] Reihold Niebuhr, *Man's Nature and His Communities*, p.83.
[48] Howard Clinebell, *Basic Types of Pastoral Counselling*, Chapter 2.
Clinebell now proposed a new approach in the revised and enlarged edition, Basic Types of Pastoral Care and Counselling, namely, the 'Growth Counselling' - it emphasizes pastoral care as the nurturing context of pastoral counseling. (Cf. pp.324-327 and 448.)
[49] Paul E. Johnson, *Person and Counselor*, pp.93-94.
He also explained his theory as 'dynamic interpersonalism' in his book, Personality and Religion.
[50] Seward Hiltner, *Pastoral Counseling* and *Preface to Pastoral Theology*, especially, pp.23-41.
[51] Ibid., 'Judgment and Appraisal in Pastoral Care', *Pastoral Psychology*, pp.43-46.
[52] Carrol Wise, *Pastoral Counseling*, 16/159, pp.66-68.
[53] Wayne Oates, *The Christian Pastor*, Chapter 2 and 7.
[54] Philip Rieff, *The Triumph of the Therapeutic.*
[55] Rodney J. Hunter (edit.), op.cit., p.848.
[56] Howard Clinebell, ' The Challenge of the Speciality of Pastoral Counselling', *Pastoral Psychology*, 15/143, p.21.
Seward Hiltner, 'Association of Pastoral Counselors: A Critique', ibid., pp.11-14.
[57] Cf. 'The Crucial Role of Small Groups', *Pastoral Psychology*, (March 1967), pp.5-13.
[58] Charles V. Gerkin, 'The ACPE of the Seventies', ACPE News 3(2) and 'Focus on the Community', ACPE News 6(2) quoted in Powell, op.cit.,pp.22-23.
[59] William E. Hulme, 'Concern for Corporate Structures or Care for the Individual?', *The Journal of Pastoral Care*, vol.23, and Thornton, op.cit., p.211-233.
[60] James H. Cone, *For My People*, p.7.
[61] Charles V. Gerkin, *Prophetic Pastoral Practice*, p.35.
[62] James M. Washington, *A Testament of Hope: the essential Writing of Martin Luther King, JR.*, pp.14-15 and p.89.
[63] Cone, *Speaking the Truth*[ST], p.100.
[64] Ibid., p.101.
[65] Gayraud S. Wilmore, 'Pastoral Ministry in the Origin and Development of Black Theology' in James H. Cone and Gayraud S. Wilmore (edit.), *Black Theology: A Documentary History*, vol. two, 1980-1992, pp.116-120.
[66] Cone, *Black Theology and Black Power* [BTBP], p. 5.
"The term 'Black Power' was first used of 1966 by Stokely Carmichael to designate the only appropriate response to white racism". See Dwight N. Hopkins, *Black Theology UAS and South Africa*, p.7.
[67] Cone, St, pp.104-105.
[68] Cone, *My Soul Look Back*, p.46.
[69] Cone, BTBP, p.6.
[70] Ibid., p.109.
[71] Vergel Lattimore, 'The Positive Contribution of Black Cultural Values to Pastoral Counseling', *The Journal of Pastoral Care*, vol.36, pp.105-117.
[72] Cone, *A Black Theology of Liberation* [BTL], p.28.
[73] Dwight N. Hopkins, op.cit.,p.10.
[74] Alvin F. Pouissant, *Why Blacks Kill Blacks*, p.109.
Charles M. Pierce, 'Psychiatric Problems of the Black Minority', in S. Arieti (edit.),

American Handbook of Psychiatry, pp. 512-523.
[75] William H. Grier and Price M. Cobbs, *Black Rage*, p.22.
[76] Wilmore, op.cit.,pp.121-122.
[77] Cone, BTBP, p.11.
[78] Elaine L. Graham, *Transforming Practice*, p.12.
[79] Edward P. Wimberly, 'Pastoral Counseling and the Black Perspective', *The Journal of Pastoral Care*, vol.30: No.4, p.268.
[80] Meretle H. Wilson and Michael R. Lyles, 'Interracial Pastoral Counseling with Black Clients,' *The Journal of Pastoral Care*, vol.38: No 2, p.138.
[81] Wilmore, op.cit., p.124.
[82] Edward P. Wimberly, 'Minorities' in Robert J. Wicks, Richard D. Parsons, and Donald E. Capps (edit.), *Clinical Handbook of Pastoral Counseling*, p.304.
[83] Ibid., p.306.
[84] Cone, BTL, p.20.
[85] Ibid., p.156.
[86] Howard Clinebell, *Growth Counseling*, p.72.
[87] Wimberly, op.cit., p.311.
[88] Wimberly, op.cit.,p.311.
[89] Gerkin, op.cit.,p.95.
[90] Ibid., p.35.
[91] Sergio Torres and John Eagleson (edit.), *Theology in the Americas*.
[92] James Newton Poling, *Deliver Us From Evil*, p.131.
[93] 'Decree on the Apostolate of the Laity' (*Apostolicam Actuositatem*), Chapter 1 and 5.
[94] 'Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World' (*Graudium et Spes*), Preface 4.
[95] Thomas Oden, *Care of Souls in the Classic Tradition*, Chapter 2.
[96] Oden, *Pastoral Theology*, p. x.
[97] Don S. Browning, *The Moral Context of Pastoral Care*, p.8.
[98] Ibid., p.15.
[99] Ibid., p.25.
[100] Browning, *Religious Ethics and Pastoral Care*, Chapter 6.
[101] Ibid., Chapter 8.
[102] Erikson's Schedule of virtues: hope, will, purpose, competence, fidelity love, care and wisdom. See Donald Capps, *Pastoral Care and Hermeneutics* [PCH], pp.141-144.
[103] Edward Thruneysen, *A Theology of Pastoral Care*.
[104] Capps, *Life Cycle Theory and Pastoral Care*, pp.34-37.
[105] Ibid., p.55.
[106] Ibid., Chapter 5.
[107] Capps, PCH, p.49.
[108] Ibid., pp.68-82.
[109] Gerkin, *The Living Human Document*, pp.44-47 and p.123.
[110] Ibid., Chapter 5.
[111] Gerkin, *Widening the Horizons*, Chapter 2 and 3. And Prophetic Pastoral Practice[PPP], p.10, 59,m and 63.
[112] Gerkin, PPP, p.16.
[113] Ibid., Chapter 4, 5, and 6.
[114] Rebecca S. Chopp and Duane F. Parker, *Liberation Theology and Pastoral Theology* [LTPT], p.4.
[115] Chopp, 'Practical Theology and Liberation' in Lewis S. Mudge and James N. Poling (edit.), *Formation and Reflection*, pp.120-136.
[116] Chopp, LTPT, p.18.
[117] Poling, 'Race, Gender and Class in Practical Theology,' *Contact* 120, 1996, pp.1-7.

CHAPTER 3 MODERN PASTORAL THEOLOGY IN THE UNITED KINGDOM

An Introduction to Pastoral Theology in Great Britain

Admittedly, it was not until after the Second World War that modern pastoral theology was innovatively transformed in the Great Britain. It is mainly because pastoral theology had been generally considered a practice-based and experimental discipline that is functionally performed in particular situation. Accordingly, its dominant model and approach had been usually taken a mixture of practical knowledge and skill together with an initiative apprenticeship under a well-experienced pastor.

One historical aspect of British pastoral care has noted that the first half of the 20th century saw the decline of pastoral theology from being 'a serious theological discipline' to a ministry oriented 'handy tips' on 'how to' practise the ministry.

However, as already observed in the United States, psychology and psychotherapy had also influenced British society and culture at large by the 1960s. By comparison with American pastoral theology, it was rather late that the impetus was to change the British pastoral care. To put it another way, because the pastoral care was not influenced promptly by such a therapeutic revolution, up to the 1960s there hardly occurred any events such as the clinical pastoral care movement in the United States.

At this point, however, there existed a few experiments where several pastoral practitioners tried to relate pastoral theology to modern psychology. Earlier in this century J.G. McKenzie and H. Guntrip conducted some fresh approach on purpose to respond to defects, which they perceived in education for pastoral ministry. Both found in the work of Sigmund Freud insights relevant for pastoral care and exercised an important influence through their psychotherapy, teaching, and writing. More importantly, it is not overlooked the name of Leslie D. Weatherhead, because his pastoral theology was typical of psychologically informed pastoral care among the early pioneers of the British modern pastoral theology.

Leslie D. Weatherhead (1893-1976) was a Methodist pastor of the City Temple in London, and was well known for establishing a Church Psychological Clinic in collaboration with psychiatrists, psychologists, and physicians. As for his great concern with psychology, when he served as a staff officer in the First World War, he had been stimulated to study the relation between the new psychology and the work of the ministry. Shortly, Weatherhead learned eagerly about the contributions of Freud, Jung, and Adler to pastoral work and sought the cooperation of physicians in Leeds. In particular, he became deeply interested in the church's ministry of healing, through psychotherapy, intercessory prayer, and the curative power of religious faith.

Consequently, when he began to work at the City Temple in 1936, he found not only the medical psychiatric clinic but also a regular program of intercessory prayer and spiritual healing. In 1951 he published his doctoral thesis entitled *Psychology, Religion and Healing* that explored nonphysical methods of healing throughout the history of the church. He furthermore described its purpose in a sub-title: A critical study of all the non-physical methods of healing, with an examination of the principles underlying them and the techniques employed to express them, together with some conclusions regarding further investigation and action in this field.[1]
The book is divided into seven sections, which may be summarised as follows:

(A) Christ's healing miracles; healing in the Early Church; demon possession.
(B) Earlier methods of healing through Psychology-Mesmerism, Hypnotism, Suggestion.
(C) Modern methods of healing through Religion-Laying on of Hands, Lourdes, Christian Science, Healing Missions, Intercession, etc, with a detailed account of the several Church organisations concerned with spiritual healing.
(D) Modern methods of healing through Psychology, such as Freud, Adler, Jung, and McDougall; composite methods in psychotherapy.
(E) A discussion of the nature of health, and of (a) guilt, (b) deprivation of love, and (c) other emotional states as causes of illness; and the relevance of religion. An examination of Jung's and Freud's attitude to religion.
(F) The nature and place in healing of (a) faith, (b) science, with illustrations in confession, worship, and asceticism.
(G) The modern search for healing through psychology and religion. The needs of the integrated personality, pastoral and medical co-operation, the Church psychological clinic; and Conclusions and Signposts.

Undoubtedly, the most significant contribution of Weatherhead lay in the fact that he tried to combine pastoral ministry with the psychotherapeutic knowledge of Sigmund Freud, Carl Gustav Jung and Alfred Adler. Particularly it can be found in the fact that his efforts, aimed to develop pastoral practices such as confession, liturgy and intercession, implied the service of psychological healing. However it is appropriate here to say that, as Elaine Graham points out, "Weatherhead's approach may be distinguished from other British writers on religion and psychology during this period, in that he seemed concerned with the critical interpretation of the significance of the modern psychologies for the human condition, rather than their appropriation in the service of more effective pastoral ministry."[2] He concentrated his

interest upon dealing with guilt, the deprivation of love and their effects on the personality. Hence, he believed that the therapeutic power and insights of the modern psychologies could transform and correct distorted situations of religious faith. He greatly expected a critical integration of theological themes of sin, forgiveness and salvation with the new psychologies and psychotherapies.

It is also important to note that he successfully innovated and promoted ministerial training that all theological students should have sufficient psychological training to help them diagnose psychological illness, and that ministers and physicians should cooperate whenever possible in pastoral situations.

As mentioned earlier, a few achievements started making their impact on modern British pastoral theology around the beginning of the 60s. Several courses for pastoral training, which had different aims and objects, had formed in the field of theological education. Each course was working in almost complete isolation, in short, they had not much time or energies available for intercommunication.[3]

The Richmond Fellowship, founded in 1958 by Miss Ellie Jansen for the rehabilitation of the mentally and emotionally sick, started the course for theological students. It equipped them with not only general pastoral care and dynamic social psychology but included social community studies, sociology of religion and the Church, and the understanding of group interaction. At the Littlemore Hospital in Oxford a course opened by the chaplain, the Rev. Martin Rogers. This course was initiated for theological students from various colleges, and of various denominations. It was intended to be training for pastoral ministry in the parochial sense rather than hospital centred, especially focusing on the art of listening. We can also notice, in the more general area, that the Institute of Religion and Medicine, which had brought into being in 1963 by Dr. Kenneth Soddy, contributed to networking in the field of health and healing. It aimed at bringing together clergy and doctors for co-operate working at local levels either for theoretical discussion or practical teamwork.[4] At the request of the British Council of Churches, the Institute also embarked on a major group of consultations into the training of clergy for the theological education. The committee started in 1965 and resulted in the final publication of *Pastoral Care and the Training of Ministers*, which was then passed back to the B. B. C. for discussion and further implementation. As for this aspect, there were other new domains of interest shown in in-service training of clergy. Some Anglican Dioceses had appointed key persons to take charge of this, like Canon Derek Blows in Southwark Diocese. The Roman Catholic Church had inaugurated a sub-commission on in-service training and operated the hospital chaplaincy, but had not extended into other particular field. It was a limited training that was being offered within the hospital

settings. About the 1970s the Rev. W. Kyle became the founder of the Westminster Pastoral Foundation in Central Hall. By his experience of training in the USA he sought to make connection between pastoral care and counselling, and to create some professional standards for them. Thus, it seems likely that the appearance of training courses was somewhat sporadic. Each of the establishments had benefited from support given by their own organisations and particular leaders. Therefore, in 1972 the Association for the Advancement Pastoral Care and Counseling (AAPCC) established to promote communication between a number of groups concerned with pastoral care and education.

However, at a broad level of generalisation, unlike the development in the United States as shown in the Clinical Pastoral Care Movement, there are some decisive characteristics in the formation of contemporary British pastoral theology. It is the most noticeable fact that much of pastoral theology was due to certain leading figures, who were mostly medical doctors, and that to organisations which seldom had mutual connection and cooperation. As Paul H. Ballard pointed out pertinently, it can be seen that there was, "a persistent pattern: one person, or a group, takes local initiatives and then find themselves both responding to a need and advocating a response, which then finds its own institutional forms, more or less formal, more less official."[5]

Hence, the inquiry to be undertaken in this chapter is best described by focusing on the main figures influencing the development of British pastoral theology. As we shall see, it is surely right to say that these pastoral theologians were dedicated to the new formation of modern British pastoral theology.

1. FRANK LAKE (1914-82): CLINICAL THEOLOGY

Frank Lake was one of the outstanding persons in modern British pastoral theology after the Second World War. His main achievement, as shown in his massive work, *Clinical Theology* (1966), can be seen in the attempt to create a unique synthesis between theological and psychological ideas and to initiate a new style of pastoral training throughout the country.

As for his unique career, Lake started his work as a missionary doctor for the Church Missionary Society (CMS) in 1939, after he had been trained in medicine at Edinburgh University. During his work for above 10 years in India, he became interested in dynamic psychiatry through his co-operation with a psychiatrist, Dr F. Nichols.[6]

Unfortunately, meanwhile he could not continue his medical practice there for several reasons.[7] As a result, he returned to England in 1950. It was the great turning point

for his life. For, he came to take up postgraduate training in psychiatry at Leeds University. It is import that in his new study he was strongly influenced by the British school of psychoanalysis, such as the ideas of Melanie Klein, W. Ronald Fairbairn, and H. Guntrip.[8] These psychoanalysts were well known as 'object-relations' theorists, that is, in their fundamental belief that birth and the early life of childhood is deeply concerned with significant human psychological development, particularly with psychological trauma. Lake undoubtedly learned his basic ideas from their theories. In addition, immediately after he entered into clinical practice, he had also a significant experience in that he discovered a dramatic effectiveness of the drug LSD 25 in his practice of psychotherapy, because the use of LSD enabled him to access deep repressed memories in the early life of patients which hid their roots in psychological trauma.

In 1958, Lake came to the most significant step for his major life's work, setting about pastoral training for Anglican clergy, encouraged by an Anglican bishop, Dr Donald Coggan who was worried about the inadequate pastoral training of ordinands. Thus he soon founded in 1962 the Clinical Theology Association (CTA) at Nottingham in order to provide pastoral care and training in it based on psychological insight.

In considering Lake's unique contribution to pastoral theology, two important factors for his work must be mentioned. One concerned the circumstances of British psychiatry that had a strongly negative attitude toward psychoanalytical theory and therapy, and promoted a predominantly organic rather than therapeutic approach.

On this point Lake could exceptionally harness the effectiveness of psychotherapy at that time.[9] At a time of antipathy towards psychoanalysis and psychotherapy by organic psychiatrists, Lake was capable of exploring psychoanalytic ideas and approaches in pastoral theology. Certainly, there were some pastoral theologians such as R.S.Lee, but they were utterly dependent upon psychoanalysis and could not substantially integrate theology and psychology.

Another factor was theological education, especially in its significance for pastoral ministry. At that time there were merely traditional pastoral practices based on only parochial experience. Therefore there were a great deal of expectations invested in this ministerial training among many clergy who felt ill-equipped to work for the person in trouble and distress. The rapid growth of the CTA movement undoubtedly reflected the absence of any effective theological education which was attempting to alter conventional pastoral practices.

The significance of the CTA lay in a new experiment which enabled pastoral carers to investigate pastoral care informed by psychological method and encouraged their own personal growth.

(1) Lake's Clinical Theology: its basic theory, practice, and the CTA movement

The main works of Lake in Pastoral theology can be generally described in three areas:(I) an attempt at theorising to integrate theology and psychiatry in a comprehensive way, (II) practicing a pastoral therapy according to a new method, and (III) initiating an innovative pastoral education based on psychological knowledge.

(I) The Main Theories of Lake's Pastoral Theology

(a) The Theological Anthropology based on Object-Relations Theory of the Early Life of Childhood

Lake's theory, as already mentioned, was founded on the object-relations psychology of Melanie Klein, Fairbain, Guntrip and others, which focuses in depth upon individual dynamics in infant and childhood experiences. He further developed his own assumption from this object-relations theory, that is, a personality disturbance could be traced to a deficiency of interpersonal, fundamentally parental, relationships during the first year of life (especially the first trimester). For his theorising, he used the two interpretative hypothesis: 'preoedipal,' 'infantile' or 'birth' trauma by Otto Rank and the Pavlovian concept of 'trans-marginal stress'. That is to say, he thought he could explain more persuasively "the original emotional experience underlying all personality dysfunctions" by these theories.[10] He thus describes this interpretation as follows:

> Psychoneurosis occurs only when there has been an antecedent conflict and defeat in the same phase of existence in early infancy, and the emotions to which they give rise remain throughout life, constantly reverberating on the circuits of the memory, even though not consciously recalled, ready to reproduce themselves in later years if a similar situation appears to be rising.[11]

In this vein, because a traumatic incident or painful experience of childhood become an archetype of anxiety [archaic infantile feelings], Lake suggested, when similar pressures and tensions occur, they are perceived as evoking the original trauma. Furthermore, they might "turn a tolerably fearful present moment into an intolerably anxious one."[12] However, here we have to ask about why such a thing takes place. It is obvious, he states, that the reproducing reaction of personal pain has been rooted in unsatisfactory relationship between the infant and his or her early personal environment. At this point, Lake explains in detail:

> The roots of all the psychoneuroses lie in infantile experiences of mental pain of

such an intolerable severity as to require splitting off from consciousness at about the time that they occurred. These have remained buried by repression. The actual cause of the panic may be a time of separation-anxiety endured during the early months of life, when to be separated from the sight and sensory perception of the source of 'being' in the mother or her substitute, is tantamount to a slow strangling of the spirit and its impending death.[13]

In short, he argues, similarly to E.H. Erikson's concept of 'basic trust' that the fundamental issue of human existence lies in the separation-anxiety in a infantile period, and it is defined as 'the fear of the schizoid position of non-being and also of emptiness.'[14] Hence, this radical human anxiety is not a cause of a person's problem, but is deeply concerned with a failure of parents to respond adequately the infant's basic needs as 'being', such as acceptance and sustenance. Therefore, anxiety is considered as being due to loss of adequate relationship with the personal source of being. Lake calls the basic need for the power of 'being' 'the primary ontological requirement.'[15] Furthermore, if human anxiety is interpreted in this way, it may be logically represented that parents as the source of being are projected as the image of God on the infant's experience. It is precisely at this point that Lake really tried to integrate psychotherapeutic and theological ideas.

(b) The Dynamic Cycle as a Model in Theology and Psychodynamics

Another important concept of Lake's Clinical Theology is the model of 'the dynamic cycle' as he called it, that is designed to correlate the psychiatric and the theological. This model was derived from a study of the life of Jesus Christ, in its spiritual and inter-personal dynamics, focussing upon the Father-Son relationship in St. John's Gospel. He designated it 'an ontological model', by which the life of Christ was able to provide 'the norm' for both psychiatric and spiritual health in human existence. In other words, it is the dynamic cycle in which the love of God in Christ works through "a new dynamic cycle of relationship to those whose natural cycle had broken down"[16], so that one might recover the distorted human experience as having suffered the lack of love in infancy.

What does the dynamic cycle really mean? The dynamic cycle has four phases: two dynamic in-put phases and two dynamic out-put phases. These phases are constituted in four categories: [1] Acceptance is the power of 'being' corresponding to the primary ontological requirement. When a child is fully accepted by another person, he or she can hold a sense of 'being'. [2] Sustenance is an ongoing relationship and a quality of 'well-being' that is capable of smoothly enjoying interpersonal relationships. [3] Status is a sense of worth that enables one to be

involved in self-giving relationships. That is to say, the two in-going phases are followed by an out-going movement. Accordingly, if the in-put phases have gone well, motivation and energy are strong, and concern flows outside oneself. [4] Achievement is a result of well-functioning in this cycle. Work is done with purposeful activity, and personal relationships with others are characterised by reliability of commitment, peacefulness, hopefulness, and patience.[17]

Here, the same four phases of this dynamic cycle are found in the life of Christ, and the new dynamic cycle of Christ enables the offer of the divine outpouring power to a broken dynamic cycle of human being. Lake thus insisted that the new dynamic cycle become the unfailing resource for the transformation of human relationships and personality.

(II) Pastoral Therapy

If the roots of all the human problems in psychodynamics lie in the pain of long-lost loving relationships, Clinical pastoral work, has to begin with the re-construction of genuine interpersonal relationships. Lake therefore steadily stresses the direct contact with the person in trouble through listening and dialogue, because pastoral therapy is deeply concerned with ontological (personal) relationship (encounter) to recover the goodness of being and well-being.[18] One of the distinctive characteristics in Lake's pastoral practice is that "Lake did not use transference and counter-negative transference as a means of cure [which is common in secular psychotherapy], but rather stresses pastoral therapy in which the revelation takes place within ontological encounter-the dimension of healing in a Christian context."[19] Lake emphasised that Christ, especially in his suffering on the Cross, is able to be the ultimate therapeutic resource, because he is a silent listener through the therapeutic relationships between pastoral carer and the person in need. Very interestingly, Alistair Ross pointed out that "Lake's therapeutic model can be called 'the transcendent transference encounter' in which the pastoral relationships lead to transcendent dimension through transference therapy that is carried by the power of being and well-being."[20] How is the transcendent transference possible as the substantial resource of healing? Lake develops further his unique Christological account, and views the suffering of Christ from the fact that "the events of the crucifixion of Jesus Christ portray every variety of human suffering and evil, especially those crucial and decisive forms which suffering took during the first year of life, where mental pain weakens the foundations of character and determines its distortions."[21] Thus he writes as follows:

God has not only spoken through His Son; He has listened through his Son.

> Christ's saving work cost Him most in its speechless passivity of dereliction. It is this which gives Him the right to be called the greatest listener to all suffering. It is this which gives His listening its redemptive quality.[22]

Most importantly in Lake's Christological idea, when Christ is identified with our humanity, taking on our anxiety and bearing of our suffering, he particularly reveals the truth, 'emotional truth'[23] as the answer to the long-repressed memories of intolerable affliction in the first year of childhood. That is to say, God takes the responsibility in Christ at the Cross for the parent's failure to nurture as allowing "devastating evil which came upon them in their innocence, and absolves parents of blame."[24]

(III) The Clinical Theology Association

As already mentioned, with Bishop Coggan's recommendation, from 1958, Lake started his clinical pastoral education in various Anglican dioceses, and subsequently, established with some core groups the Clinical Theology Association (CTA) in 1962.

The CTA ran a number of seminars for human relations, pastoral care and counselling, and instructed in counselling skills, self-understanding, group dynamics and behavioral therapies. In particular, the dynamic cycle was introduced as an applicable into a frame of reference for pastoral counselling.[25] Each seminar usually lasted for three hours, and took place every three weeks, twelve times a year.

Very predictably, because there was seldom such ministerial training at that time, especially between 1958 and 1962 the work of the CTA dramatically expanded throughout the country. At its peak of the 1960s, the workshops were run in forty-one dioceses, eighteen theological colleges and several universities. Some statistics suggested that some 20,000 participants had undertaken CTA courses, and a large number of clergy (one in eleven) got their training within only eight years.[26]

However, after its success in the 1960s, the CTA gradually faced a crisis within the Association and at the same time was viewed with greater suspicion by the churches and secular professionals. It was partly because Lake was a man of strong and difficult personality,[27] and largely because his therapy was conveyed by LSD and in turn, by a new emphasis on early intrauterine trauma of the foetus ('Maternal Foetal-Distress Syndrome')[28]. Particularly, in later years, Lake stressed the importance in the formation of personality in the first trimester of pregnancy. Yet it was never fully accepted in psychiatric, psychoanalytic or theological circles, and also it caused some important members to leave the CTA. For those reasons, the CTA movement finally lost its influence in pastoral education.

(2) Critical Evaluation of Lake's Clinical Theology

(a) Lake's Methodology in Clinical Theology

In comparison with the clinical pastoral movement in the United States at that time, that was heavily dependent upon the secular psychologies, it can be seen in Lake's work that there were the enormous efforts more comprehensively to integrate psychotherapeutic insight with theological understanding. However, especially in his methodology, we have first to raise questions. In the review of *Tight Corners in Pastoral Counselling*, Alastair Campbell precisely criticised Lake's methodology as 'epistemologically confused and of dubious theological relevance.'[29] Put another way, because of his absorption in constantly assimilating new ideas and thinking, he had tended to use a lot of idiosyncratic terminology mixing scientific knowledge with his metaphors. Robert Lambourne also commented that he seemed to play a 'psychotherapeutic dance.'[30] In fact, he had quite often adopted psychiatric, existentialist, psychoanalytical and theological language without strictness and consistency in his use of each language.

Another important issue is his analogical or symbolical interpretation of Scripture. His philosophical and psychological presuppositions are too dominant over the interpretation of Scripture, and neglect utterly the critical-historical context of the Bible. Although it will be further considered later, what he saw about evil or sin seems to be highly questionable, because he exclusively identifies them with terms of interpersonal relationships in infantile experiences. In a sense, the Christ-event on the Cross was obliged to converge on the psychic and spiritual healing in inner mental health. Hence it may well be said that in this respect, Clinical theology does not persuasively exhibit a well-founded synthesis of pastoral theology with psychological insight.

(b) Too Narrow a Concept of Clinical Theology as Pastoral Theology: its disregard of social-historical context

Clearly, one of the distinctive features in the Clinical theology must be Lake's eagerness that pastoral care should aim to get at the very roots of the human psyche. However, the most unique characteristic is paradoxically linked with a serious weakness. That is to say, as Lambourne concludes, "Clinical theology's concept of Pastoralia is too narrow, too closely related to psychopathology, and too dogmatic."[31] Hereupon, some grave problems become manifest. First, due to his exclusive concern for psychopathology, he tended to be less concerned for a wider perspective of the human situation and condition. This can be illustrated with his use of LSD-25 in his early years or the method of deep breathing in primal therapy. More obviously, it can

be observed in the fact that despite many controversies and disagreements with him, he continued to emphasise birth and intra-uterine trauma.

Second, corresponding to the issue mentioned above, Clinical theology fails undoubtedly in its disregard of the historical-social context. It is partly because Clinical theology focuses on the individualistic approach of one-to-one relationship, and therefore has a strong inclination to lack the wider social-historical perspective. However, furthermore we may recognise that the greatest reason unmistakably results from his ontological thinking itself. For instance, the Christ event is utterly reduced to a mental health category as a psychological ideal model without any consideration of social-historical context. In short, Christ's redemption is completely applied to inner infantile experience.[32] Thus, the theologically vital terms, such as sin and evil, are also translated into a psychological and ontological reality caused by interpersonal relationships between infant and parents, especially in terms of the affliction of innocent suffering by parental failure. However, if the cause of innocent suffering exists in a loss of relationship with parental figures as the power of being, and that sin is an alienation from the source of being, it seems likely that sin is inevitably regarded as a result of 'ontological fate', and the interpersonal (parental) relationship becomes an internal precondition of sin. Accordingly, in this sense, it might be possible to argue there is some similarity between Lake and Paul Tillich. That is to say, the ontological thinking stressing the tragic and fated factor of human existence overwhelms the historical one stressing voluntary and moral factors in their theological anthropologies.[33] Moreover, there is no room for consideration that the separation-anxiety of human being represents creative elements in human freedom as well as a tragic element. Therefore, ontological thinking is generally too limited to express theological discourse in terms of the social-historical dimension. Particularly, it leads to a serious error when such thinking obscures the creative tension between human freedom and its destiny as social-historical existence.[34]

It may not be an overstatement that despite many flashes of theological insights in Clinical theology as a catalyst, as Hugh Melinsky concluded, "Clinical theology was as if it presumed to offer the only system of pastoral care whereas both its theology and psychology were drawn from selected portions of those very fields."[35]

Lastly, it would be fair here to note that there are some creative possibilities for pastoral care in Clinical theology. To put it simply, one is concerned with a hermeneutics of theological anthropology. Lake sees self-deception as the most pervasive human problem. He said which "human character at its most religious best is a systematic telling of lies, because every person has got weakness inside him/her."[36] Therefore, the difference between the disturbed person and the ordinary

person is only the problem about whether or not the person is a very successful liar. Of course, as far as Lake considers narrowly the human deceit in infantile experience, it is still very problematic. However if it is reconsidered from perspective of social interaction between self and society, just as Talcott Parsons did, it becomes one of the most fruitful and original tasks for pastoral theology.[37]

Second is an issue concerning the transcendental dimension of pastoral theology. As discussed before, Lake pointed out the significance of parents as an early symbol or metaphor of transcendental value. Hence, he strongly suggested the therapeutic value of pastoral therapy in the experience of revelation which takes place in the relationship. Recently many liberation theologians, especially feminist theologians, have begun to notice the fact that various images of God are apparently reflected in the internalised relationship of each person and vice versa. For that reason, it is an immense responsibility for the pastoral theologian to treat the images of God in whom we are transferentially grounded in order to evoke conscious awareness both of the oppressing factor in the false images and of liberating factor in the true image.[38] At the same time, it implies that the Church should be a therapeutic community where its members bring about awareness building of liberation in each other.[39]

2. ROBERT LAMBOURNE (1917-72): THE THEOLOGY OF SALVATION AND HEALING

Robert Alfred Lambourne was the most influential person in the development of British pastoral theology after the Second World War. Like Frank Lake, he studied at medical school (in Birmingham University), and more significantly, he had been an active member of the Student Christian Movement at the university. After his graduation in medicine in 1941, he served in the army as medical officer between 1942 and 1946. Immediately after the war was over, he came back to medical work in hospital and then settled down to work as a general practitioner in a working class community of South Birmingham. Most importantly in his life history, he became increasingly interested in the point that every disease has its social background and social causes through his numerous medical practices in this disadvantaged area. From this point he became interested in psychological medicine and psychotherapy. In doing so, he extended his studies by attending Dr. Michael Balint's courses for general practitioners at the Tavistock Clinic, travelling to London weekly for 18 months[40]. Particularly, through the regular meeting with Dr. Balint he could get "his insight into the way one patient may 'present' in his own illness the dis-ease of a whole group of people such as a family.[41]" Simultaneously, his deep concern furthermore extended to theology, especially for the bridge between medicine and theology. Hence he decided to study theology at the University of Birmingham and

concentrated his central research on the relationship of disease with socio-cultural context and religious dimension. As a result of his exploration, it was crystallised into his first book, *Community, Church and Healing* which was published in 1963. It demonstrated a fresh concept of 'a theology of healing', trying to integrate Christian faith with medical and psychiatric insights. He targeted his reflection at how to bridge between medicine and theology, from the viewpoint of health and disease with a corporate community context.

It was from 1958 to 1961 that he worked for both his general practice and the involvement of Rubery Hill Hospital as a psychiatrist. Furthermore, it was in 1965 that he was appointed lecturer in pastoral studies at the first university course in Birmingham University, and devoted his energy to developing the pastoral theology and theological education. His outstanding contribution was also seen in the fact that he was a very important member of the committee set up by the Archbishop of Canterbury which was later led to the forming of the Institute of Religion and Medicine. We should not overlook his activities as a consultant for the Christian Medical Commission of the World Council of Churches, and he undertook for them a lecture tour in the Far East, Hong Kong, Manila and Tokyo.

Although time was too short to fulfill his vision for pastoral theology, because of his early death at the year of 55, undoubtedly he had set out the direction of pastoral studies and initiated the development of the pastoral theology in Britain. Most interestingly in his unique thoughts, he stressed on a holistic approach of health, pointing at a sacramental and communal understanding of salvation which most of pastoral theology tended to neglect at that time. In this vein, it was a significant moment when he raised his strong objection to national pastoral organisation in the 1970s. He consistently expressed his great suspicion for the ongoing scene of pastoral theology and practice in the United States, because he thought it was too individualistic and psychologically informed.

(1) Lambourne's Basic Idea of Pastoral Theology: the Theology of Salvation and Healing.

The most significant characteristics of R. A. Lambourne's works in pastoral theology undoubtedly lie in his contribution in which he stressed the communal and social-political aspects of pastoral care which was largely ignored at that time. Therefore he started first of all insisting on the recovery of the holistic view of health. On this point, for example, we can find in a strong critique toward Frank Lake. He stated that "the trouble and distress of a patient that is brought to the therapist is not seen merely as one straight chain of action and reaction within the infantile

experiences of patient, but as the whole reality embracing the experiences of the patient's relatives and social group."[42]

From this viewpoint, he had particularly two main criticisms of pastoral theology and its practice, that is, gnosticism and individualism which are a trap into dualism of body and mind, spiritual matter and material, and individual dimension and corporate. In contrast, he increasingly insisted on a communal, corporate and sacramental understanding of the pastoral theology.

Now we must look through his basic idea of pastoral theology.

(a) The Holistic View of Health

Lambourne had his fundamental belief that 'the Hebraic view of man as a totality, a psycho-somatic organism animated by a soul was in sharp distinction to the Greek view which was that of an essence of mind, spirit, imprisoned in fresh'[43]. Dualism views the essence of human beings as the non-material, non-somatic spiritual being. Accordingly, it is the salvation for dualism to liberate the mind from the body and the spirit from the material. This is indeed contrasted with the Hebraic and Biblical view of human beings as a soul-animated body. The Biblical and Christian idea is the proclamation that because Jesus has brought our salvation not by escape from the fresh but by the eternal life incarnated into fresh and the world, there totally disappeared the false separation between mind and body, individual and community, spiritual and material, sacred and secular. Thus Lambourne advocated a theology of healing based on the holistic view of human beings, and communal understanding of illness and health. In this way of thinking, he insisted that health and disease is conceived to be as much an effect and product of realty by the whole society as the reaction of the body to the original trauma.

Very interestingly, it is just at this point that Lambourne was interested in the new knowledge of psychiatry. He explained:

> Psychiatry's great contribution to Medicine and to religion has been mediate a social revolution by challenging the fallacy of isolated concreteness of diseases and sins. To show Medicine and religion that both these concepts must be seen in a much wider and interacting context, a context that stretches from the present subconscious mind out into present and past cultures; so that both the way a man sees his own predicament and the way we see another man's predicament is coloured by all these factors. Most recently we are gaining a much wider understanding of how man comes to see badness and goodness in himself and in the world.[44]

Therefore, Lambourne acknowledged that modern psychiatry has changed dramatically both our understanding of the medical concepts of sickness and our understanding of the religious concepts of sin.

> Instead of an almost exclusive view of diseases as local material badness in the flesh and an almost exclusive view of sins as local moral bad acts of the soul, both sins and diseases have increasingly come to be seen as joint evidences, different clusters of symptoms and signs, of a relational disorder within man and between man and his environment. This revolution has largely been mediated through psychiatry.[45]

At the same time, when such localizable defects of the soul and body in the concepts of both medicine and religion were questionable, there was naturally a challenge to the excessive individualism, and the excessive localization of badness. Hence, as discussed later, he extremely worried about the current tendency of pastoral theology in the United States, because of its spiritual healing based on an excessive individualism and an excessive gnosticism. He thought that despite the fact that many of the sources of human distress are institutional or socio-political in character, there was a grave lack of appreciation of the social aspect of disease. Pastoral care that deals only with the distressed individual has tended to ignore social forces that cause the distress. However, it is the most inevitable factor for proper understanding of human health to give due emphasis to the social pathology of disease. Undoubtedly, health must be realised to be wider than the individual, because health and disease do not simply reveal a function of individual body and personality, not even in the symptomatic aspects, but the function of a whole nexus of relationships between many people.[46] Accordingly he said:

> One symptom, of any one person, is an expression of the whole equilibrium of all people and is experienced by all peoples. It needs to realize how often it is necessary to see a man's complaint as a symptom of the disease of a group, and consequently to set about treating the patient through the group. It is the child who is presenting the mother's disease. Only if the mother is changed can good results be expected in a child suffering from such complaints as migrainous headaches, facial tics, bed-wetting, and numerous other troubles.[47]

A theology of healing, therefore, has to envisage health and disease as a 'situation' which involves not only a personal, medical problem, but also one involving a much

wider society, and its social pathology, such poverty, inequality, injustice and so on. It is obviously true that the concept of health and the concept of justice are inextricably entangled.[48] Lambourne continuously stressed that it is an essential factor for pastoral theology to take into account of the connections between wider society and the troubled individual. Therefore, he was obliged to raise the alarm over the situation that the theory and art of loving had become separated from the theory and art of justice in the modern pastoral care movement.

(b) Therapeutic Community (Life-Giving Fellowship)

The characteristics of Lambourne's ideas, as already mentioned, are undoubtedly to advocate a theology of healing through the holistic view of disease and health. Arguing for a view of humankind as social being, he tried to correct the individualism and gnosticism in the pastoral practice. For him, health and disease are not merely in the individual and psychic context, but also in corporate, physical and material context. Therefore, he further suggested the idea of corporate and 'representative' nature in human existence, which is explicit and implicit in the Old Testament and the New Testament[49], and thereby he pointed to the holistic approach of therapy in which every person is accepted in the corporate context of healing or salvation. Lambourne describes this representative nature as follows:

> Christ's healing works, considered in their representative aspect, showed that man's sin-sickness situation is communal as well as private. We have also shown, that God requires that men and women shall see the sick man bearer of their own infirmities, and that they shall, as representatives of men in Christ, stoop to share this burden.[50]

Put it another way, the sickness-healing situation is regarded as a 'crisis' situation for the whole community group in which it occurred, and represents a symptom of a communal disorder as well as a private crisis. In this vein, the healing work of Christ was not primarily a private event between one person and God, a response for a sick person, but an 'public effective sign' that the works of God should be made manifest through him or her in community.[51] Lambourne now called Christ's sign 'prophetic symbolism' or 'universal symbol', demonstrating the actual work of the Divine purpose.[52]

It was meant that the healing works of Jesus as prophetic action were signs of the Kingdom of God, confronting the religious and cultural authority that produce and define the concepts of sin and illness. Thus he explained:

> God through Christ did a new thing, a scandalous thing, such as healing the outcast leper (the man who because of planning priorities, poverty, moral depravity, rural location, underdeveloped country, skin colour or religion is deprived of just health care deliverance) on the Sabbath (the man whose disease is supposed to be ordained by God like the pain of women in childbirth or the venereal disease of prostitutes, or the babies of unmarried mothers), he was doing a powerful new self-revelation.[53]

It is surely right to say that that Lambourne proposes a theology of culture as pastoral theology, on the basis that Christ's healing has not only individual dimension, but also religious and cultural dimension. His healing denoted new revolutionary concepts of health and salvation based upon love and justice for all human beings. Needless to say, it was indeed the dangerous performance that led to upsetting the sacred rules of religious, cultural and juridical authorities in the Jewish community. Nonetheless, he was crucified for disclosing a new knowledge of sickness, evil, healing and deliverance. Such a new and scandalous acts of love and healing was revealed in Jesus Christ incarnated in the world, and penetrated through the barriers between the true human health (radical humanisation) and the present sin-sickness situation.[54]

It is at this point that there enters Lambourne's conception of the therapeutic community. That is to say, the Church is a sharing community where human beings come to gather at the centre of suffering, and participate with healing works in such a way as to challenge the worldly and professional understanding of health and healing, sin and salvation. Surprisingly, he regarded such a community as the mystical body.

> The mystical body is not the ecclesiastical apostolic congregation that we call the Church, but the mystical body of suffering men and women. Those who would join the Mystical body must have communion with a sufferer. In the sufferer does faith know the real presence and by communion with each partake of the spiritual Christ. Christian sacraments are effective signs of unity between God and man, and between man and man. They declare and make visible and present the mystical union of God in Christ with his Church and the sufferer.[55]

Thus, the mystical body means a suffering community, where the sick person is joined to it, and together they enter with Christ into the salvation. However, we have to ask about what Lambourne intended to define as salvation. He believed that just

as crisis is a creative chance for response to a higher quality of life, salvation does not mean a mere return to the previous situation. It results in a new integrity at a higher quality of life. To put it another way, salvation comes not only through the eradication of evil, not only despite evil, but also through an adequate response to evil by the power of God.[56]

Another important idea in his pastoral theology, is the Biblical term *Koinonia.* In the New Testament, *Koinonia* means 'life giving fellowship' and particularly directs us to the sacramental nature of all life. Therefore, it embraces the wholeness of life, whether earthly things or religious things, and builds up the 'Communion of Saints' where "'to be saved', 'healed', or 'made whole' by faith in Christ is to enter a community of suffering, and to have new experience of suffering and the Resurrection triumph of Christ."[57] From the point of view of *Koinonia*, it is fair to say that Lambourne clearly prospected for the main task of pastoral theology, namely, community building, and that he wanted to transform the current scene of pastoral practice focusing on individual welfare.

(2) Lambourne's Criticism of Pastoral Theology in the United States

There was no person like Lambourne in the Great Britain who castigated the pastoral counseling prevailing in the United States. For example, we can quite easily recognise this in his words as follows.

> Pastoral counselling called for in Great Britain during the next twenty years cannot be built around a practice and conceptual framework derived from professional problem solving and prevention of breakdown. That practice and conceptual framework is based upon the clinical, medical, and psychoanalytical models of the U.S.A. of twenty years ago, and it has proved inadequate.[58]

He did not hesitate to give it words such as 'a virulent psychological pietism' or 'love affair with psychotherapy'. He became undoubtedly the most influential voice for pastoral theology between the 1960s and the 1970s in the United Kingdom. Particularly, it was a highly argumentative period when he opposed 'a too rapid move toward institutional structures with an over-professionalised understanding of ministry based on a problem-solving, counseling-orientated approach'.[59] He viewed the national pastoral organization as resulting in producing a hierarchy of highly specialists with accreditations. It was really dangerous tendency, he thought, for the development of pastoral care rather than advantageous, because he expected the clear direction of pastoral practice that was activated the role of the group or team in

the healing work, rather than the work of skilled professionals [60].

To simplify, there were two main suspicions in his criticism toward the American pastoral counselling movement, that is, over-professionalism without ecclesiastical context and the disregard of ethical formation.

(a) Corporate Practice for Community Building: Anti-Professionalism

As already described, whereas Lambourne had criticised openly the professionalism underlying psychotherapy and counselling, he has his perspective on the fruitful development in a pastoral care which is 'lay, variegated, adventurous and diffuse'[61]. He challenged pastoral care to become more corporate and voluntary activities, because of his objection to professionalised practice of pastoral ministry based on a problem-centered, counselling-orientated approach. Rather, what is required, he believed, is a holistic approach to care in the context of ordinary life and by long-term responsibility, and that such a way enables people to work corporately for a struggle against various social pathologies.

In his way of thinking, it was very understandable to be reminded of the great voluntary sector called Church, where people are 'trying to do the will of God in the service of others and each other'[62]. Therefore, pastoral practice should aim its distinction at ecclesiastical services. It is indeed certain that there are many vital possibilities that the local church can contribute to the social welfare services, such as promoting local opinion and local community action.

Lambourne furthermore strongly asserted the sacramental life to be definitely important for pastoral care in the Christian community, and he also confirmed that "the excessive individualism of ecclesiastical services to the sick might have been avoided if there had been closer association between ecclesiastical ministrations and other merciful and loving acts done by Christians to the sick."[63] To put it another way, the pastoral care should be performed through corporate action in the context of sacramental life; namely, liturgy has tremendously rich meanings for pastoral care in the reality of the corporate action in the Christian community.

We can extend the pastoral practice into various ministries of the Church, for instance, the visitation to the sick, catechism and so on. Visitation, he said, 'is the liturgy to the sick in the local church. We see then that the visitation of the sick is the making present of Christ by the Church's act of obedience.'[64]

However, to this end that pastoral care play the part of community building, first of all, Lambourne advised that the pastoral minister must learn not only the pastoral skills, informed by modern personal counselling techniques, but also the pastoral techniques available from social group work.

(b) Pastoral Care and Ethical Formation

We have already seen Lambourne's standpoint that we have to be more conscious of a close linkage between the troubled individual and society. With this argument of his, another serious issue caused much criticism. He raised the question about the posture of psychotherapy and counselling, which are based upon a therapeutic technique and upon a clinical method that do not involved ethical value issues. Such a counselling model takes place the mutual relationship between the client and the therapist, and primarily focuses all attention on individual experiences, so that it easily falls into neglecting the influences of social forces on individual. Hence, it does not succeed in understanding properly either the importance of what shapes a person or the environmental factors.

> Counselling model encourages a kind of secular pietism, which is only concerned with social issues to the limited extent of requiring that society should not interfere with individual rights. Such social, economic and political *laissez-faire* is an analogue of a model of personal knowledge and therapeutic relationship which takes too little account of the way in which the other person does not merely allow me to become what I ought to be but also creates in me that which I ought to be.[65]

He considered that psychotherapy, in particular, was practised in an 'artificial situation' of professional skill, and therefore pastoral counselling which is too closely attached to it would be very debatable and could be mistaken.[66]

It is indeed the case that if the artificial situation excludes the social context from the therapeutic relationship, there must be in fact 'a separation of the theory and art of living from the theory and art of justice'.[67]

Now he claimed there was a specific problem in the connection of pastoral care and ethics. This was, as well known in the Rogerian counselling, the counselling mind and the attitude embodied in the technique, such as 'unconditional acceptance' and 'unconditional commitment'. However, is it true that the therapist and the client are not involved in any ethical judgment? Of course, it is impossible, and especially in the pastoral care, it is not desirable, because counselling can be considered as a process of persuading as to what it is right to do and discern. Accordingly, therapist, counsellor or other helper is invited to take more seriously the ethical context and the ethical formation of the client, even though in effect the counselling attitude, such unconditional acceptance, produces a kind of result.

In addition, it is very important to reconsider that in the Christian context, especially

in the Bible, pastoral theology is just the theology of corporate ethical formation. Although there is a false presupposition of the modern counselling mind that moral judgment may mean a negative and hostile attitude, it is not applicable to the Christian ethical context. In the Biblical context, there is no contradiction between mercy and judgment, love and justice. Certainly, there were in St. Paul's letters references to the old law that only leads to condemnation and death, yet now it is revealed in Christ that perfect love was never compatible with hostile judgment but rather, eradicates fear and embraces judgment. Lambourne was therefore obliged to state:

> This poor psychiatry, this poor theology, which seeks wholeness through basking in each other's 'cheap grace', is different from good psychotherapy or good theology, where reconciliation, the love and knowledge of one another, has been 'bought with a price', by 'costly grace'. 'Doing the truth' in psychotherapy requires love and moral judgment.[68]

It is true of course that there are many good things about a warm relationship based on compassion and acceptance in pastoral care. Therefore there is a strong suspension for the unacceptable and harmful effects of judgmentalism and moralism that might err on the side of empathy, acceptance and compassion in helping encounters. However it is possible to consider that avoiding the negative features of judgmentalism or moralism, we should find out some compatibility between judgment and moral, acceptance and compassion. Most importantly, it is at this point that the question arises how to create moral enquiry with troubled and confused individuals without becoming moralistic. In fact, empathy and confrontation are both important aspects for the relationship of the troubled person seeking help.

Here we may listen to a very interesting dialogue between Martin Buber and Carl Rogers. This shows how essential for pastoral care is the mutual confrontation and mutual understanding concerning the value judgment. Buber said to Rogers:

> Acceptance is meant that I take you just as you are, but that is not yet what I mean by confirming the other. Confirming means first of all accepting the whole potentiality of the other and even making a decisive difference in his potentiality. Confirmation does not mean that I do not want to change. Rather it says, just by my accepting love, I discover in you what you are meant to become.[69]

Very understandably, Buber stressed that unconditional acceptance in the

therapeutic relationship requires the confrontational and confirming element in order to become what we ought to be rather than to be just as we are. Accordingly, it is fair to say that Lambourne rightly affirmed the nature of pastoral care. That is to say, he suggested that pastoral care should regard as its prime task the ethical formation of a supportive and responsible community. For that reasons, apart from the counselling mind that is underpinned by the narcissistic culture of 'I'm OK, You're OK,' pastoral care has to break 'ego-formation' and create 'we-formation'. It is, he believed, significantly realised by seeking for corporate identity based on being for others, namely, the dynamic conversion process from comfortable ego-formation to we-formation in a context of *Koinonia.*[70]

(3) The Evaluation of Lambourn's Theology

In considering Lambourne's thoughts, it seems to us that they were a genuine prophetic voice for pastoral care. In fact, he proposed pastoral care as a theology of culture that has the large scope of corporate and ethical formation. Certainly, it meant a drastic change of its purpose and its task, namely, community-building for corporate ethical formation and mutual aid in the local community. He tackled a new direction and reframing of pastoral care. He describes the new definition as follows:

> ***Pastoral care, of which pastoral counselling is a part, is separated from its very life unless it is substantially concerned with the continual renewal of the holiness-in-service of the Church as koinonia rather than being preoccupied with the ego-formation, identity righteousness, or salvation of its individual members.***[71]

Hence, in short we may evaluate his pastoral theology from the three viewpoints.

(a) Politicisation of Pastoral Theology: Art of loving and Art of Justice

Lambourne had already been alarmed by the present situation of pastoral theology, especially the climate in the United States, which had the tendency to ignore communal, social and political aspects of pastoral care.

First of all, his characteristics therefore can be recognised in his claim that pastoral practice must not "avoid the responsibility of a personal and social confrontation with those evil in the world which are intertwined with their own personal and social life. It was developed too much in a ghetto situation that encouraged unconscious tribalism and neglect of problem of justice."[72] For this task he had a design for theology of healing that belongs to theology of culture.

There were many rich insights in his pastoral theology. It is, for instance, exceedingly

important that he never apprehended disease as suffering reality isolated from the social causes. He insisted on illness as metaphor that reflected and embodied social and cultural forces in the society. If we do not take into account disease in the social context, it may cause us to become supporters of the political *status quo*, and in addition, we are not capable of translating our every day experience of human suffering into demands for 'political' reformation.[73] In this sense, it is indispensable to politicize pastoral theology, integrating art of loving and art of justice. In fact, many of his successors have developed his insights further and have tried to change the tasks, such as hospital chaplaincy and theological education in pastoral care.

(b) Therapeutic Community

As discussed above, the communal dimension, with its requirements for justice and responsibility, is another essential theological theme in Lambourne's theology. He defined that the aim of pastoral care as to build up the therapeutic community as *Koinonia* through the corporate and ethical formation. We can greatly value his consistent concern for the ecclesiological context of pastoral care. In this context, he argued:

> We-formation in we-responsibility is a more central image than building up the ego, self-realisation, or those other similar images, which have tended to dominate modern psychotherapy.[74]

However, as Alastair V. Campbell pointed out, it is obvious that he did not fully explain how this we-responsibility is to be achieved.[75] At this point Lambourne does not show clearly any concrete description. He just offers rather vague and conventional remarks, for instance:

> To do this, such groups must in their meeting find a style of waiting on the word, a way of feeding on the biblical image to which we have referred, and a style of sacramental celebration, which knows no division between the grace of insight given in the shape of revelation within the we-identity on the one hand and the gift of power to be committed to a responsible decision to act on the other hand.[76]

Presumably, on this point we may take note that he focused on the suffering community as the body of Christ. For him, the Church can be called the mystical body of Christ in terms of suffering, and therefore salvation was not meant merely to escape from suffering, but to join to it. Here would open the great possibilities of sacramental life in pastoral care. Accordingly, we come to realise how greatly we

depend upon each other, and how the sacramental life in the Church based on corporate action is essential to mutual care and support in healing and welfare.

As for another aspect of the therapeutic community, we are now much surprised at his foresight. That is to say, he claimed the necessity of the artificial and therapeutic small community. There is a growing recognition how the community life influences the apprehension and treatment of disease in the individual, and as a result, there is a tendency for the treatment of mental illness to shift its location from the mental hospital out into the community. We are now know that there are at present numerous such artificial therapeutic communities. We need to create such a therapeutic community where we are to build each other up into the wholeness of good life. Hence, it might be said that the vision of community building is to aim at a social and cultural transformation. Undoubtedly, in doing so, pastoral care finds a new front away from individual inwardness towards corporate outwardness, and is getting to work for ethical formation and a new consciousness of people.

(c) New Approach in Theological Education

Around the 1960s there was generally nothing available in ministerial training for ministers to respond effectively to the people in need and to fit them for their pastoral responsibilities. One document concerning theological education reported:

> In modern Great Britain with its complex of welfare agencies the ordinand and ministers often feels himself isolated from the majority of people, apparently ill equipped in comparison with other professionals. Their own training, and the present activities and structures of the Church in which they serve do not enable them as effectively as they might to help people to find their fulfillment and the joy of better human relationships, in relation to Christ.[77]

However, there is serious question what exactly the pastoral role of the ministry should be, in short, what should be its differentiation from those of other professionals such as psychiatrist and social worker.

Lambourne was the most influential person in the development of theological education, particularly in the field of pastoral ministry. As a full-time lecturer, he started teaching in the first university course.

Like William S. Keller in the United States, Lambourne encouraged theological students to learn from actual situation, and from social work rather than psychotherapy and counseling. Because of his strong concern for corporate and ethical formation, as already observed, he criticized the individualistic, problem-centered approach in psychotherapy and counselling. For that reason, he instructed

the students in practical theology which was well balanced between on the one hand pastoral counselling and clinical pastoral care and on the other hand field work in depressed urban situations.[78] It must be mentioned that he believed much more strongly from his experiences of lecture trip in the Far East, that "the newer approach to health (no longer concentrated on the eradication of local disease in the individual but concerned with sociological and wider concepts of health) provides a broad and suitable background for theological reflection and experiment."[79]
He furthermore paid much attention to the interaction between theological studies and field experiences. He wrote:

> In terms of training seminarians, it does not mean that they are given agency placing in society merely to practise the insights gained through theological studies or sensitivity groups in the seminary. It means channelling the learning experience of trans-cultural shock outside the seminary into the seminary.[80]

This proposal seems to be still valuable to the present situation of many theological institutions. We have not enabled to create the new framework of theological studies, integrating between academic studies and field experiences. However the time has gradually come to construct the scheme of theological studies with a dynamic integration of sociological and psychological knowledge, theory and praxis.
Although Lambourne regrettably died in his middle fifties, it may well be said that he left many unfinished agenda items by his prophetic voices.

3. NEW DIRECTIONS IN THE MODERN BRITISH PASTORAL THEOLOGY

It can thus be said that the development of British pastoral theology blossomed out after about the 1960s, especially through the great contributions of Frank Lake and Robert Lambourne. Most of pastoral theologians therefore produced their own surveys directly or indirectly under these influences. It is possible here to say that although there were various attempts after these giant figures, the fundamental direction in pastoral theology was followed by the works of Peter Selby, Alastair V. Campbell and Stephen Pattison.

In the first place, one of the most influential voices was Peter Selby in his book, *Liberating God* (1983). He pointed out that the urgent requirement for pastoral care is not only to understand the individual persons, but also the public world in which social and political pressures are affecting the lives of individuals.

He also stressed like Lambourne that the private and the public world of human lives are connected like the strands of a rope and we cannot separate individuals from their environment. Nonetheless we easily fall into dualism that divides our spirit from our body and mind, our religion from our secularity and our personal from our public lives. Hence he strongly suggests that "pastoral practice has to be politically and socially aware."[81] Thus pastoral work and spiritual care should be set for the struggles of politics, and its aim is not exclusively to realize an individualistic ideal of spiritual health and personal growth.

In this vein, we may discover his strong direction in two features.

Selby first insists that we must have the consistent perspective of integration in pastoral theology and practice between care for individuals and care for wider society. It is just at this point, he criticizes all counselling and casework approaches for tending to individualise problems.

> They transmit the assumption that the best a distressed person can hope for is to acquire the ability to adapt with less distress to circumstances that cannot be changed. When Christians counsel, there is the further risk that the great themes of the gospel, salvation, sin, forgiveness, are similarly individualized. God becomes one who holds us accountable for our inability to fit in and offers to treat us with forgiveness and grace to conform. Such a God leaves unaccountable and untreated the dynamics of a society in which some are firmly locked into the position of victim in the simultaneous cycles of racism, poverty, and homelessness.[82]

Human sufferings are largely related to the disturbance and dislocation in the world, and the illness has to be seen and dealt with as a communal phenomenon that is manifested as a sign in the pressures and conflicts of society at large. Pastoral care therefore has its task and its attention directed to this deep dislocation of individuals in their context in society. We can no longer take a too simple view of human suffering that is only related to the inner private area. Accordingly, "to presume to care for other human beings without taking into account the social and political causes of whatever distress they may be experiencing is to confirm them in their distress while pretending to offer healing."[83]

Secondly, what has been said above may appear to be so obvious that the essential problem lies in the social location of pastoral theology and practice in society, especially in relation to the oppressed.

To deal with individual experience as though it were simply the private property of

> the individual who is having it is to reduce it to insignificance, We neutralize the efficiency of our pastoral care by using it as a means of isolating people from the question of where they stand in the dramas of oppression and liberation, of peacemaking or warmongering in the world outside.[84]

To put it simply, it is a great temptation for the ordinary person, especially middle-class people, to avoid taking the position of confrontation with the dominant forces in society and also to ignore the superhuman struggle (Ephesians 6:12) that manipulates human lives in this world. To put it more practically, it means that pastoral practice does not only focus on sympathy but also solidarity with the suffering and the troubled persons. It requires "a taking of sides rather than listening, looking beyond the pastoral relationship and beyond the concern with spiritual personal growth." In this sense, Selby concludes that "caring is a liberating, socialist activity."[85]

In turn we can see in Alastair V. Campbell that pastoral theology is undertaken in a more comprehensive way. In fact he is well known as the editor of *A Dictionary of Pastoral Care* (1987). He demonstrates a deep concern for pastoral care how to be freed from the captivity of professionalism. In his book, *Paid to Care* (1985), he suggests that pastoral care can be defined more simply as 'a kind of friendship, an offer of a loving relationship '[86] and 'to help people to know love, both as something to be received and as something to give.'[87] Very predictably, however, it is true the most simple things become most difficult, because they are more complex and more demanding than the actual reality we can suppose. Indeed, if pastoral care is professionalised by such as psychotherapy and counseling, there is a great danger that it may lose the spontaneity and the mutuality which are essential factors of love. Yet on the other side there is much facile ignorance about the naïve attitude of the amateur. Therefore Campbell has rejected the idea that "professionalism in pastoral care should be equated with pastoral care by ordained clergy, but this does not imply that the knowledge, skill, responsibility and commitment associated with professionalism should be totally swept aside."[88] However, why does he strongly suspect of professionalism in pastoral care? It is possible to consider that he has two main reasons, that is, the decisive neglect of the social and political context, and the lack of mutuality in a pastoral relationship. One-to-one relationship in professional care easily fosters the tendency to disregard the social evils which destroy humanity. The social and economic advantages put obstacles in the way of seeking social change or social criticism. As a result, the intensity of the one-to-one encounters of professional practice exposes the insufficiency in respect of the socio-political context

of care. Another feature is the issue of mutuality or corporate nature in pastoral care. Indeed all professional care and helping activity depends on a particular form of knowledge and skill in order to engage with clients. Admittedly, such a situation creates a division between helper and helped and brings a kind of superiority and dependency into the caring process. Yet it is probably fair to say that mutuality, vulnerability and equality are distinctive characteristic of pastoral care. Thus Campbell concludes that:

> Thus professionalism may be regarded as a kind of captivity, shutting away both helper and helped from the full possibilities of care. This captivity has various features: lack of mutuality; maldistribution of influence and power; intellectualism; neglect of the communal dimension; and resistance to radical change.[89]

It seems better here to make it clear that what new directions Campbell proposes for the alternative model of pastoral care. To begin with, he takes up the idea of *Koinonia* which is an open gate to the wider society and a place for the encounter between the Church and the world, personal and social issues. It does not mean the Christian community exclusively, but a sharing community of mutual support in which personal and social care significantly develop. Once Lambourne suggested that Jesus' healing was not only significant for individuals but for whole communities in confronting them with the grace and judgment of God. Pastoral care is ultimately aiming to work for the purpose of realising the Kingdom of God. Therefore the theory and art of loving must be set in the context of the theory and art of social and political justice.

Campbell also suggests the importance of image, metaphor and story in pastoral practice. He emphasises that "story rather than theory must become the mode both of understanding the problem and of offering care."[90] It is by story that we are capable of entering into others' worlds and participating in the reality of the other person's world. In this sense, it may be said that pastoral care is a really risk-taking commitment.

As discussed above, Campbell undoubtedly intends to explore fresh insight of pastoral care, as observed in his book *Rediscovering Pastoral Care* (1981). There he pointed out "there is a contemporary sense of confusion about the true nature of Christian caring and a feeling of alienation from traditional understanding of the pastoral task."[91] Where has such confusion come from? He explained that it has been partly caused by the uncritical adoption of psychology and counselling; at the

been partly caused by the uncritical adoption of psychology and counselling; at the same time it comes from the conventional style based on priestly authority in pastoral care tradition. Thus stressing a self-critical awareness of pastoral care, he demonstrates very persuasively the need to restore the three images of caring person from the Bible; the shepherd's courageous leadership, the power of the wounded healer and the wisdom of the fool.[92] This is not the place for a full discussion of the three images, but it is wise here to consider them briefly.

As for the image of shepherd, it does not always give a good impression, because it Is felt like a paternalistic type of care. Yet Campbell dares to pick up the image:

> One of the most vivid aspects of the biblical image of shepherding is courage to the point of risking one's own life. But there are also other features of the shepherd's character - a mixture of tenderness and toughness, skill in leadership, concern for wholesomeness and self-sacrifice.

As Henri Nouwen showed impressively in his famous book, *The Wounded Healer* (1972), Campbell also highly evaluates the powerless power of the wounded. Surely the effectiveness of pastoral care does not depend upon the superiority or strength of professional performance, rather a helping attitude for the troubled which "comes from our own experience of pain, fear and loss and our own release from the deadening grip."[93] Through our own experience of sorrow, loss, failure and grief, we can enter into the depths of another's experience of loss and pain, and find healing together. In this vein it is important to note that pastoral care, unlike medical treatment, does not primarily aim to remove pain or suffering, but to deepen its experiences and meanings in the perspective of God's saving work. Therefore he is exactly right in his statement:

> A minister is not a doctor whose primary task is to take away pain. Rather he deepens the pain to a level where it can be shared....[94]

Thirdly, Campbell takes note of the image of wise folly that is a kind of wisdom and belongs in prophetic imagination. He therefore describes that:

> The fool who challenges order and insists upon simple truth, discloses God as a God of revolutionary zeal for the truth.[95]

Indeed the strange and unexpected deed of the fool points at a transcendental value

and reality beyond human understandings. Pastoral care needs such a prophetic performance because it mediates a new awareness and attitude to life. It may function as a kind of catabolism that is a vehicle of God's laughter at human's arrogance and self-importance.

Thus Campbell shows the three models as an attempt at rediscovering pastoral care. It is appropriate to say that these lead to the rich possibility of hermeneutic in the pastoral theology. At this point, however, there is a criticism from Stephen Pattison. He argues that "Campbell carefully selects tree particular images from the Bible ...He does not discuss his view of the Bible and its authority or the degree of normativeness which should be ascribed to particular scriptural texts. Images selected in this way therefore is over simplistic or incomplete making them misleading as well as illuminating to some extent."[96] Nonetheless it will undoubtedly be said that Shepherd, wounded healer and fool undoubtedly represent the revisionist models for pastoral self-understanding and demonstrates the new approach of pastoral theology in the United Kingdom.

It is indisputable that Stephen Pattison is the most provocative pastoral theologian after the 1980s. Just like Campbell he has developed his thought from the criticism of the present situation of pastoral care and theology, because pastoral care is essentially focused on a matter of giving personal care to individuals, it will lead to a disregard of the major social evils which affect human lives. At the same time, he complains that pastoral theology has inherited the bad legacy from the past, showing intellectualism or the neglect of theological thinking, paternalism, individualism and sexism.

In *A Vision of Pastoral Theology* (1994) he clearly portrays his idea of pastoral theology. He firmly recommends the granting of 'a major place for word play, metaphor, symbol, narrative, image and story in pastoral theology.'[97] Hence he first proposes 'transformational knowledge' which contains practical wisdom and corresponds to different dimensions in reality. Put another way, he wants to claim that pastoral theology should not dominantly be rational, rather become a more imaginative, creative activity which uses images, metaphors, myths, and stories.

> Transformational knowledge, it involves intuition, wisdom and mystery...It arises from people's experience of living...it is knowledge that makes a difference, changing and transforming people and situations even as it is itself transformed and changing.[98]

In this sense, Pattison suggests that it is better for pastoral theologies to be

founded by transformational knowledge rather than action guiding, because action guiding simply ties one in a process of translation of theory into practice. However matters are so much diverse and complicated, and human being is never a wholly logical or rational being but a mysterious one. Accordingly Pastoral theology must become responsible for complex realities of life, and produce a new way of being and transform people in their thoughts and actions. Pastoral theology can take its role significantly through performing a metaphorical way of thinking as well as thoughts and actions.

Perhaps the most noticeable criticism by Pattison of pastoral theology lies in the fact that he first of all insists on 'socio-politically aware and committed pastoral care'. Regardless of whether it is in the Catholic tradition or the Protestant, many people would consider pastoral care as essentially directed toward individuals. The consequence is that this leads us to lose sight of social and corporate aspects of pastoral care. Just here it is important, as Pattison points out, that we have to be aware "no human attitude or activity is politically innocent in a world divided between oppressed and oppressors."[99] If we do not consider the implications of pastoral practice in the context of the social causes, such as class, race and gender, which affect the oppressed, we would make a grave mistake in pastoral praxis. Pastoral care always faces the tension of whether it should take a position to hold some social norms or to challenge those norms. Accordingly, as we shall see, he counsels pastoral theologians to become critical, not only of their practice and role, but also of their religious belief, tradition and institution itself in relation to the social context.
In this vein, he cannot unquestioningly approve of the equation of pastoral care with individual counseling. An individual and counselling-focussed pastoral care virtually pays no attention to social and political context or the concern for social change as a solution to individual problems, and it results in colluding with structures of injustice and oppression. Hereupon, Pattison criticises the psychologically-informed pastoral care from the several viewpoints; that is, too narrow individualistic scope, problem-solving and crisis-focussed approaches. As a result, he demonstrates more clearly his innovative definition of pastoral care in his own book, *A Critique of Pastoral Care* (1988).

> ***Pastoral care is that activity, undertaken especially by representative Christian persons, directed towards the elimination and relief of sin and sorrow and the presentation of all people perfect in Christ to God.***[100]

In this definition, we can immediately notice several important points. First, he

stresses that the aim of pastoral care is not only to concern with sin and sorrow, but also to bring people to a positive goal through growth and fulfillment. Certainly, he suggests that without losing sight of concern for individuals the wider social and political dimension is integral to the nature of pastoral care.[101] Next, he has his criticism of the problem-solving approach adopted by many in pastoral practice, because it concentrates too much upon the crisis. Yet "An important countervailing trend in recent pastoral care theory has been an emphasis on working holistically with people in the normal circumstances of their everyday lives and communities to maximize their well-being."[102] Hence he proposes two main themes for pastoral care to vivify human potentiality and theological resource; namely, failure and laughter.[103] In these realities we can find a place where people are faced with the senselessness of sin and evil, and contrarily, an experiences of grace, hope and creative possibility.[104]

So far has it been argued that there is an urgent need to go beyond conventional models of pastoral care focused on individual needs and create socially and politically aware and committed ministry. From this viewpoint Pattison now finds a great possibility in Liberation Theology that "presents a real challenge to the theory and practice of pastoral care in the Northern hemisphere."[105] In short, it is the issue about how pastoral care in the Northern hemisphere can be liberated from its own practical and theoretical limitations and narrowness. In his recent remarkable book, Liberation Theology and Pastoral Care (1994), Pattison discusses in much more detail the new perspective of pastoral theology related to liberation theology.

First, there is the basic belief in liberation theology that history is the place where God is revealing himself in the liberating activity of the oppressed. Thus history is a continuous process of being invited by God's eschatological promises whose fulfillment lie in the future, but whose effect is felt now. Even more specifically, it is important to notice that "the locus of God's saving activity is amongst the poor struggling for liberation."[106] According to liberation theology, in their 'hermeneutical privilege,' the poor have a particular and important place in understanding the will of God and in initiating the process of liberation. Therefore the preferential option for the poor has a great practical meaning for liberating action in the struggle of the oppressed. A this point Pattision argues that "traditional theologies have tended to treat social and political awareness and action as the arena of applied Christian ethics, deduced from fundamental doctrinal principles." Yet there is a decisive difference between traditional theologies and liberation theology. It is because "liberation theology claims to be a way of approaching the whole of theology which must be recast from the standpoint of the option for the poor."[107] In this context pastoral care is required for situating its position and perceptions of the oppressed

within wider social structures and the wider socio-political order. Admittedly, "liberation theology challenges pastoral care to become aware of its arbitrary limitations and its involvement in the structures of injustice, in the interests of pursuing wider social and political practice in the cause of human flourishing and liberation."[108]

Second, liberation theology shows pastoral care how the broadening of its scope and vision by utilizing the new knowledge and theory from the field of sociology, politics, and social policy have not sufficiently informed pastoral practice.
Particularly the most outstanding contribution of the social sciences is to declare that all human discourse is conditioned by the socio-political nature of reality.
It obviously means that socio-political analysis of aspects of theological discourse, ecclesiastical institution and tradition has exposed its unseen biases and interests, as well as bringing liberating inspirations. Accordingly, from the perspective of the insights and methods of liberation theology, the most decisive warning for pastoral care presumably is the situation that "pastoral care may have been too myopic about its socio-political context, implications and biases. It has failed to recognise oppression and to analyse pastoral situations in terms of injustice and conflict of interest."[109] Many people may insist on the neutrality of Christian faith and action in relation to history, or to the political arena. However, if pastoral care cannot be aware of such practical implications and biases, it will take inevitably political stands with various ideological captivities to the dominant classes and the unjust status quo in society. It is fair to say that by investigating the ideological taints of Christian institutions and traditions, we can recognize how much theology and Christian ministry mistakenly regards itself as being politically neutral. Whether it is conscious or not, they are bound up with the existing social situation and actually serve the interests of those who are dominant in the social order. In such a situation it is hardly surprising that pastoral care has helped to make the poor invisible and been complicit in maintaining injustice. Pastoral care should be open to the voices of the powerless on the margins, recognize its own implicit and explicit biases, and adopt a preferential option or bias towards the poor and marginalised with a view to helping them attain their own liberation.[110] For that purpose it will be an urgent and essential task for pastoral care 'to clarify the socio-political implications and context of pastoral care as a prelude to engaging in socio-political aware and committed pastoral action.'[111]

Third, pastoral care has been generally regarded as atheoretical and practical centred endeavour and consequently found it difficult to develop critical theories of action. Liberation theology inspires pastoral care to develop new practice based on

critical reflection of engagement with its task. Liberation theologians declare that 'Theology will be a critical reflection from and about the historical praxis of liberation in confrontation with the word of the Lord lived and accepted in faith,' or "Theology is a critical reflection on praxis (liberating activity) in the light of the Word."[112] In this vein, here lies the issue of what part you have played in the effective and integral liberation of the oppressed. This is so called the idea of 'orthopraxis' which is the viewpoint of critical reflection on liberating action and establishes the validity of it.[113]

We have observed so far how much pastoral theology can be inspired by liberation theology in the eyes of Pattison. Yet it is true of course that, as Pattison mentions, "there may be a danger of 'experiential fundamentalism' within liberation theology, whereby it is assumed that because something is true in the contextualised praxis of Latin American Christians it must be true for all Christians everywhere."[114] Hence Pattison has tried to contextualise pastoral theology into the social context of the U.K. from the perspective of liberation theology. Particularly he concentrates his attention on the proper understanding of the situation of mentally ill people within the context of the wider socio-political order. This shows a new model of pastoral care 'in the face of the dehumanizing social and political forces shaping and distorting human well-being at all levels in society.'[115]

Lastly, we must say a little more about new directions of pastoral theology in the United Kingdom by referring to the two outstanding theologians, Elaine Graham and Emmanuel Lartey.

Clearly important developments in pastoral theology have been brought about by feminist critique of pastoral care and feminist consciousness. Elaine Graham strives to develop an indigenous women's pastoral theology and transforms pastoral practice and theology that is based on patriarchal ideology and paternalism.[116] She tries to broaden the perspective of pastoral care into previously 'unfinished and untouched' areas such domestic violence, child abuse, single parenthood and divorce.

Emmanuel Lartey, as a Ghanaian theologian, is much interested in multi-cultural issues in pastoral care. [117] He examines various models of pastoral care and explores the re-visioning pastoral theology for a new way of life together in cultural diversity coping with sexism and racism. The most noticeable feature is that by focusing on liberation as pastoral praxis he pursues a new model of pastoral care integrating private care and public struggle.

Now it seems wise, before moving into the next chapters in which is dealing with Japanese social context and a new paradigm of Japanese pastoral theology, to make it clear about what the central direction of pastoral theology in these western experiences is. Certainly, there must be essentially the place of care for individuals,

but as observed so far, it is true of course there are many limitations in such a personal-individualistic approach in pastoral care. However it is not meant that we should find a single theory that can transcend the polarities between care of persons and ministry for the larger social structure. Rather, because the self and the wider world are intertwined, we need a common framework for pastoral theology related to social context, in short, "to care for persons is to create new worlds; to care for the world is to built a new personhood."[118] Therefore, it may well be said that apart from 'the dominance of the existential anthropological paradigm' or 'hierarchical care model of pastoral care functioning as a tool of social control' in pastoral care, "the classic pastoral care tasks of healing, sustaining, guiding, and reconciling are expanded to include prophetic efforts toward emancipatory liberation, justice-seeking, public advocacy, and ecological partnership."[119]

---

1 Leslie D. Weatherhead, *Psychology, Religion and Healing.*
2 Elaine Graham, *Transforming Practice*, p.68.
3 Marteau Louis, 'A Short History of Pastoral Care and Counselling in Great Britain and Its Present Challenge,'*The Journal of Pastoral Care*, vol.27. No.2, pp.94-95.
4 Ibid., p.96.
5 Paul H. Ballard, *Foundation of Practical Theology*, p.15.
6 John Peters, *Frank Lake*, p.47.
7 Alistair Ross, *An Evaluation of Clinical Theology*, p.159.
8 Roger Hurding, *Roots and Shoots*, pp.82-88.
9 Carol Christian (edit.), *In the Spirit of Truth*, p.44 and p.114.
10 Peters, op.cit., p.126.
11 Frank Lake, *Clinical Theology*[CT], pp.141-142.
12 Frank Lake (Abridged by Martin H. Yeomans), *Clinical Theology*, p.4.
13 Lake, CT, 1966, p.10.
14 Lake, ibid.,p.1061 and 1072.
Lake focused upon the Schizoid personality as expressing the basic human situation within the different types of neurotic suffering, such as hysteria, paranoia, depression, etc. That is, he considers separation-anxiety is shown as detachment and introversion which the schizoid personality reveals as the result of deprivation of a sufficiently caring relationship.
15 Lake, ibid.,p.133.
16 Ibid., pp.206-208.
17 Ibid., pp.133-134.
18 Ibid., p.10f and p.503.
19 Alistair Ross, op.cit., p.98.
20 Ibid., p.37 and p.97.
21 Lake, op.cit., p.18.
22 Ibid., p.14.
23 Ibid., p.25 and p.232.
24 Ibid., p.190, p.729 and p.1103.
Lake stated, in agreement with Paul Tillich, that sin and evil are alienation from God, the ground of being and it is an inevitable situation for the human being to be involved sin and neglect the ground of being. However, in his peculiar thought, these realities of sin and evil are completely located in the first infant months.
25 Frank Lake, *Tight Corners in Pastoral Counselling*, p.47.

[26] Ross, op.cit., p.146.
[27] Ibid., pp.119-120.
[28] Peters, op.cit., pp.138-141.
[29] Alastair Campbell, 'Where Have We Got To In Pastoral Studies?' *Contact* 88.
[30] Robert Lambourne, 'Treasure in a Large Earthen Vessel' in Michael Wilson (edit.), *Exploration in Health and Salvation*, p.90.
[31] Ibid., p.92.
[32] Peters, op.cit., p.88.
See Alistair Ross, op.cit., p.85. 'The Cross in Clinical Theology is only concerned with redemption, but not atonement.'
[33] At this point, it is very useful to recall that there was a very important controversy between P. Tillich and Reinhold Niebuhr.
See P. Tillich, 'Sin and Grace in the Theology of R. Niebuhr' in H. R. Landon (edit.), *Reinhold Niebuhr*: A Prophetic Voice in Our Time, p.37 and 35.
R. Niebuhr, 'Reply to Interpretation and Criticism' in Charles W. Kegley and Robert W. Bretall (edit.), *The Theology of Paul Tillich*, p.217. And Charles W. Kegley and Robert W. Bretall (edit.), *Reinhold Niebuhr*: his religious, social, and political thought, p.433.
[34] Peters, op.cit., p.22.
Lake highly valued The Theology of The Pain of God, written by a Japanese theologian, Kitamori Kazo.
However, between the 1960s and 1970s in Japan, Kitamori's theology was severely questioned, because he did not seriously take into account the social-historical reality of human suffering, but rather had a strong tendency to talk only metaphysically about the pain and suffering of God.
[35] Hugh Melinsky (edit.), *Religion and Medicine*, p.119.
[36] Frank Lake, Manuscript of Lecture in Finland (1978), quoted in Christian (edit.), op.cit., pp.88-120.
[37] For example, Stanley Hauerwas, *The Peaceable Kingdom*, Chapter 3.
[38] Alistair, op.cit., p.101.
[39] Lake, op.cit., p.206f and 813f.
[40] *Contact* 44, spring 1974, pp.2-5.
[41] Michael Wilson (edit.), *Explorations in Health and Salvation*, p.1.
[42] Robert A. Lambourne, *Community, Church and Healing*, pp.13-14.
[43] Wilson (edit.), op.cit.,p.9.,
[44] Ibid. p.55.
[45] Ibid.p.54.
[46] Lambourne, op.cit.p.90.
[47] Wilson (edit.), op.cit.p.10.
[48] Ibid.p.41.
[49] Lambourne, op.cit.pp.45-46.
[50] Ibid. p.64.
[51] Ibid. pp.35-36.
[52] Ibid. p.40.and 126.
[53] Ibid. p.49.
[54] Wilson. op.cit.,p.47.
[55] Lambourne, op.cit.p.72.
[56] Wilson. op.cit.,p.21.
[57] Lambourne. p.105.
[58] Wilson, op.cit.p.69.
[59] Rodney J. Hunter (edit.), *Dictionary Pastoral Care and Counseling*, p.110.
[60] Wilson, op.cit.p.15.
[61] Ibid. p.69. and *Contact* 88.
[62] Wilson, op.cit.p.79.

It may well be said that Lambourne has resisted narrow professionalism. Yet this shows undoubtedly the negative side that 'there is much unthinking ignorance about ways in which caring could pastoral task, this is too limited. Pastoral care has fallen into the trap of thinking too narrowly about how people's welfare might be sought and their potential developed.' See Stephen Pattison, *A Critique of Pastoral Care*, p.24.

[63] Lambourne, op.cit. p.126.

[64] Ibid.p.113 and 116.

[65] Wilson, p.63.

[66] Alastair V. Campbell (edit.), p.260.

[67] *Pastoral Care and the Training of Ministers*, P.65.

[68] Lambourne. op.cit. p.155.

[69] Wilson, op.cit.p.62.

[70] Ibid. p.82.

[71] Ibid. p.98.

[72] Wilson. p.87.

[73] *Pastoral Care and the Training of Ministers*, op.cit. p.65.

[74] Wilson, op.cit. p.98.

[75] *Contact* 88.

[76] R.A. Lambourne, Personal Reformation and Political Formation in Pastoral Care, *Contact* 44.

[77] *Pastoral Care and the Training of Ministers*, op.cit. p.7.

[78] Robert Lambourne, 'With Love to the USA' in M.A.H.Melinsky(edit.), *Religion and Medicine*, p.133.

[79] Wilson, op.cit. p.96.

[80] Lambourne, 'With Love to the USA', p.141.

[81] Peter Selby, *Liberating God*, p.100.

[82] Ibid., pp.35-36.

[83] Ibid., p.76.

[84] Ibid., pp.51-52.

[85] Ibid., p.7.

[86] Alastair V. Campbell, *Paid to Care*, p.4.

[87] Ibid., p.1.

[88] Ibid., pp.54-55.

[89] Ibid., p.40.

[90] Ibid., p.65ff.

[91] Alistair V. Campbell, *Rediscovering Pastoral Care*, p.1.

[92] Ibid., p.17.

[93] Ibid., p.37.

[94] Henri Nouwen, *The Wounded Healer*, p.94.

[95] Campbell, *Rediscovering Pastoral Care*, p.110.

[96] Stephen Pattison, *A Critique of Pastoral Care*, pp.122-123.

[97] Stephen Pattison with James Woodward, *A Vision of Pastoral Theology* (A Contact Pastoral Monograph), p.4.

[98] Ibid., pp.12-13.

[99] Ibid., p.23.

[100] Pattison, *A Critique of Pastoral Care*, p.13.
A.V. Campbell has his own definition: Pastoral care is that activity within the ministry of the Church which is centrally concerned with promoting the well-being of individuals and of communities. The ultimate aim of pastoral care is that of ministry as a whole, i.e. to increase love between people and between people and God. Its specific functions are healing, sustaining, reconciling, guiding and nurturing.

[101] Ibid., p.66. "The most vivid example of a corporate emphasis in recent pastoral care literature is to be found in E.Mansel Pattison's pastoral care of systems.

Pattison suggests that rather than paying exhaustive attention to needy individuals, the pastor of a parish should be 'shepherd of system'."

[102] Ibid., p.199.
[103] Ibid., Chapter 7 and 8.
[104] Ibid., p.143.
[105] Pattison, *Liberation Theology and Pastoral Care*, p.9.
[106] Ibid., p.44.
[107] Ibid., p.40.
[108] Ibid., p.5.
[109] Ibid.,p.8.
[110] Ibid., p.67.
[111] Ibid., p.10
[112] Ibid., p.32.
[113] Ibid., p.33.
[114] Ibid., p.56.
[115] Ibid., p.266.
[116] Elaine Graham and Margaret Halsey (edit.),*Life Cycle:Women and Pastoral Care.* And Graham, *Transforming Practice.*
[117] Emmanuel Lartey, *Pastoral Counselling in Inter-Cultural Perspective.* And *In Living Colour.*
[118] Larry Kent Graham, *Care of Persons, Care of Worlds*, p.13.
[119] Ibid., p.20.

CHAPTER 4 EMPEROR (TENNO) SYSTEM AND THE SOCIAL CONTEXT OF JAPANESE MODERN SOCIETY

Before enter into exploration of a revised pastoral theology in Japan, it is necessary to survey the social/historical context of pastoral theology. As indicated earlier, the reason why Christianity is suspected as an alien religion in Japan has been reviewed briefly in this thesis. It is certain that this vast issue has been the source of enormous arguments and investigations from various points of view. However what is intended here is not to deal further with these arguments. Perhaps there is nothing to do better than consider the most distinctive factor in Japan's modern history, that is to say, the fact that the Tenno System has taken its place definitively in coordinate axes between diachronic and synchronic processes of modern history.

Once Takeda Kiyoko concluded, "When Christianity is embedded in the soil of Japan, the most difficult impediment which it will inevitably confront is the Tenno system. --- As Christianity takes root in Japan, there are aspects of the Tenno system, which might alter and emasculate the nature of Christianity."[1] Accordingly, the consideration of the Tenno system anticipates a decisive clue to our understanding of the issues and tasks facing Japanese society and the Church.

1. A Prehistory of the 'Modern Emperor(Tenno) System'

Contrary to the popular idea that Japan has had a long tradition of reverence for the emperor, the fact is that the emperor system was remote from the actual power structure for a long time.[2]

There is certainly a myth and legend that the Japanese imperial line is traced in supposedly unbroken order to the mythical founding of the country in 660 B.C. by a descendant of the supreme sun goddess, so-called Amaterasu. However historically, it is impossible to inspect the origin of the imperial institution with precision and its history can only really be traced back to the 7th century A.D.

Furthermore, it should be noted that although the term Tenno is usually translated as 'emperor', it might be misleading, because "the term Tenno implies religious headship, whereas emperor implies primarily a political headship."[3] It is certain that the only period of Japanese history in which the emperor was regarded as both the political and religious head[4] of the nation was from the reign of Tenji in the latter half of the 7th century through to the reign of Kanmu at the end of the 8th and beginning of the 9th century. After the Heian period (866-1160), the emperor lost real political sovereignty and remained a monarch without power as high priest of Shinto. Therefore the emperor had lived in almost total isolation from the nucleus of the

ruling class in society until the end of the Tokugawa period.

However, in the early 18th century an influential school of thought known as National Learning had gradually won popular acceptance among townspeople and samurai (warriors) as the ardent advocate for the restoration of Shinto and imperial rule. Particularly the main message of National Learning was to 'recover' an idealized, pure mentality and world view ascribed to the ancient Japanese, to return to the thought and consciousness of the ancients before the country became 'polluted' by contact with foreign culture and religion.'[5] And also, Restoration Shinto in the early 19th century, which arose out of National Learning, severely attacked Buddhism as the established religion that was an indispensable tool of the feudal control system in the Tokugawa shogunate. Thus, the imperial institution and Shinto religion had been highly marginalised for a long time in Tokugawa society. However, they eventually became a powerful ideological weapon for the overthrow of the shogunate at the end of the Tokugawa period. Especially, National Learning and Restoration Shinto held a solid conviction "permeated with the ideal of restoring imperial rule, and of the repudiation of foreign influence"[6]; they became a strong ideological foundation known as the 'Kokutai (National polity)' doctrine for the future leaders of the new Meiji state. As a result, the revival movement of Shinto and the reverence for the emperor after the Meiji Restoration no longer could be understood without considering the great influence of National Learning.

Therefore, in modern history since the Meiji Restoration of 1868, the emperor system was completely the result of 'the invention of a new religion'[7].

2. THE MODERN TENNO SYSTEM AND STATE SHINTO

When the Meiji Restoration began in 1868, the new government immediately proclaimed the restoration of imperial rule and that the Tenno had to be central to politics and society. As a result the Tenno was to exercise greater political power than in any previous form in Japan's history.

Predictably, the Meiji new state was faced with a tremendous crisis brought about by the imperialist encroachment of Western countries, and there was an urgent need for the government to build a modern nation and state as soon as possible, in order to cope with these foreign pressures. However it is quite understandable that at that time the majority of the people could not understand the ideas of 'nation', 'state' or even 'Tenno'. The early Meiji elite, therefore, were convinced that a great step in government policy had to be made in order to establish the paramount power and authority as an axis or anchor, to which all the people and institutions would be bound, as the foundation of a definite sense of national and cultural identity.

Hence, the Meiji government pushed several new policies forward between 1868 and 1884 for the nationalizing of Shinto. These included the instituting of the Shinto Department (in 1867 and revised in 1869), the order for the separation of Shinto and Buddhism (in 1868), and the Great Promulgation Campaign (1870-1884)[8]. Thus, State Shinto had begun to function as an essential organ of the government in order to implant in the people the doctrine of the national polity (Kokutai) centered in the absolute authority of the Tenno. And also this 'Kokutai' doctrine was propagated "among the public by two powerful organs that had also been created by the Meiji oligarchy: the conscript military and the national education system"[9]. There were no other instruments as effective as compulsory education and military conscription that would bind the people to the emperor cult and worship through moral instruction.

Now, the emperor system can be divided into three historical stages in general: the first stage of the establishment of modern Tenno System lasting from 1868 to 1905, the second of the absolute Tenno System from 1905 to 1945, and the third of the Symbolic Tenno System from 1945 to present.

(1) The Establishment of the Modern Tenno System (1868-1905)

The first period between the Meiji Restoration and the Russo-Japanese War, was characterized by a shift from the emperor as an instrument for the legitimization of the actual power structure to the emperor as a head of national polity (Family State). The leaders of the Meiji government emphasized the importance of the emperor as the source of the national polity, but at first they found it difficult to persuade people of this because the emperor was far from the real world. Therefore, if the emperor's authority was to be legitimized as the most powerful ideological tool for ruling the people, it was necessary to invent an ideological frame of reference.

For that reason, the strategy was taken up to encourage the people to "an understanding of the state by linking it to the most prevalent social institution, that is, the family. According to the official government analogy, just as the family has a head, the father, so also does the State have a head, the emperor."[10] This concept of the 'family state', which merged the ideas of political loyalty and filial piety, became the strong ideological core in Japan's modern history.

It was a prominent professor Hozumi Yatsuka, who made important contributions to the dissemination of the family-state theory, particularly through the national textbook of the prewar times. Below is his famous interpretation of the family state:

> The embryo of the family-state is in the family-situation---the basic elements of social organization are present in----this primitive kinship group. The family-state

system----is nothing more than the expansion of this concept---to be obedient to the family head is to be obedient to the spirits of the ancestors. The throne in the nation is the location of the spirits of the imperial ancestors; and the present emperor sits on the throne in the place of the imperial ancestors.----For the race to be obedient to this power is to be obedient to the spirits of the imperial ancestors. The state is a great family; the family is a small state: this is the great basis of the founding of our racial state, and here is the source of our Kokutai.[11]

It was obviously intended that the people in the state were to fulfill their loyalty to the emperor just as they would fulfill their filial obligations to the father in a family. In 1889 the Meiji Constitution[12] was promulgated as the legal and moral basis for a new modern state under a decisive impact of the German [Prussian] Constitution. Nonetheless the Constitution itself was not denoted as the safeguard of intrinsic human rights, which were derived, instead, from the emperor as a reward for loyalty. Accordingly, the whole ethos of the Constitution "was rooted not in the rights of individuals but in their duties as obedient subjects."[13] As regards freedom of religion, therefore, it was not surprising that Japanese subjects were granted it only to the extent that religion did not interfere with fulfilling their duties to the state.

Subsequently, the Imperial Rescript on Education[14] of 1890 was announced which became the pillar of prewar Japan's ethics and morality. It also made loyalty and filial piety into absolute, universal values that could not be questioned or subordinated to anything else by using the family concept of the state based on Confucian ethics as its integrating core. And it was far more influential "as a result of its use than because of its content. Copies were distributed to all public elementary and middle schools, and all school children were required to memorize it from the second grade."[15]

In 1893,Inoue Tetsujiro, philosophy professor at Tokyo Imperial University, published a hostile attack against Christianity in six periodicals and concluded, that no Christian could be a good Japanese subject. Christianity is absolutely anti-national, because of the inevitable conflict between the Imperial Rescript on Education and Christian ethics, the former based on a particularistic patriotism and the latter on 'indiscriminate' universal love.[16] It evoked the most important controversy on the supposed discrepancy between nationalism and Christianity in early modern history. Japanese Christians were openly suspected whether or not they would accept their responsibility for the national polity following this controversy. Thereupon, Japanese Christians were expected to pay their central attention to Article 28 of the Constitution, much more than before. That is:

Japanese subjects shall, within the limits not prejudicial to peace and order, and not antagonistic to their duties as subjects, enjoy freedom of religious belief.

Thus, gradually almost no Christian could raise any question as to the place of the Tenno as it had been sanctioned by the Meiji oligarchy. In other words, "Japanese Christianity was to be deprived of precisely those beliefs that made it Christian."[17]
Both the Meiji Constitution and the Imperial Rescript on Education had successfully established the Tenno's role as that of the center and spirit of life of the national structure. The Tenno steadily enhanced himself as a living god and his 'imperial will' was to regarded as the divine orders which the people had to obey unequivocally. Moreover, there was no institution that checked the sovereignty of the emperor.
In the meantime, in the face of the demand for freedom of religion and for the separation of government and religion, the government elaborated a new pretext: that is, a new ideological framework, that Shinto is a non-religion or a supra-religion. Though Shinto priests of imperial and national shrines[18] had already been prohibited from performing funerals since 1882,[19] the Meiji government developed more strongly a policy of distinguishing Shinto from religion in general. As noted earlier, this idea resulted from the great influence of the National Learning of Hirata Atsutane that Shinto should be limited so as to be involved only in the state ritual. As a result, to make matters worse, "it was legitimated to make participation in shrine rites obligatory, in particular, school children and members of the armed forces."[20] Unquestionably it had the clear intention that if shrines were engaged with the nation's rites in governmental functions then they should be distinguished in status from other religious institutions.[21]

After 1880s, the Meiji government extended enormously the notion that State Shinto belonged to a completely different category from other religions and therefore its rites were an essential part of all personal and political life. Thus, in effect, "shrine observances were a part of a subject's civic duty, and they had an obligatory character."[22] In the circumstances, there was increasingly rooted in society the notion that Japanese subjects were free to believe in a religion but were restricted in practising it publicly. Nonetheless very ironically, as Helen Hardacre pointed out, it is true that "while State Shinto was in many ways profoundly influential in prewar social life, this situation yielded the paradoxical result that it did not permeate the religious consciousness of the people very deeply."[23]

These elaborations of the cult of Tenno veneration through government policies, such as the Constitution, the Rescript and State Rituals, opened the way to much

repression. In this sense, it led to the unavoidable conclusion, that whereas in Western countries modernization meant a process for the realization of secularism against absolute monarchs or state power, in Japan, as it were, 'counter-secularisation', which the divinity of the emperor was to legitimate, arose in the midst of Japan's modernization.[24] Therefore the Meiji politicians were obliged to cover up the contradiction between the transcendent status of the emperor above the constitution and the modern appearance of the state under the European [German]-type constitution.

(2) The Expansion and Dismantlement of the Absolute Tenno System (1905-1945)

This second stage, which began from the end of the Russo-Japanese War (1905), was characterized by the absolutisation of the emperor's position that shifted from that of an organ of the state to that of a divine entity.

After Japan's victories in the Sino-Japanese War of 1894-95 and the Russo-Japanese War of 1904-5, the Meiji emperor was becoming to be the absolute monarch imbued with a sort of divine entity. At the same time, the state tried drastically to implant State Shinto into social life more thoroughly than before.

Unquestionably, the Sino-Japanese and Russo-Japanese wars provoked nationalistic and militaristic feeling among Japanese people. Hence, Shinto shrines throughout the country became central as agencies for the nationalistic and patriotic campaign. In this way, from the end of the Russo-Japanese War to 1945, the State and Shinto built a close relationship in order to manipulate a heightened mood of bellicose nationalism and a cult of the war dead.

Now in particular, there was no other institution that had more deeply stirred up this national life by "the creation of a cult of fallen military combatants - apotheosized as 'glorious war dead' - than the Yasukuni shrine."[25] In 1869, a Shinto shrine named Shokonsha was built in Tokyo to enshrine the spirits of those killed in the Meiji Restoration. In 1879, this shrine was renamed the Yasukuni Shrine. In the early Meiji period the government policies for State Shinto had set up a single hierarchy of shrines with Ise at the top, while the Yasukuni shrine was granted the special status of imperial shrine ranking with the Ise grand shrine. It was the only special shrine under the jurisdiction of the Ministry of the Army and Navy, because its main function was the performance of rituals for the war dead. Although it was already recognized as the symbolic head shrine for all who had died for the state since 1853, now it became the most powerful vehicle for the glorification of war, especially for the significance of war dead.

As for the ideological strategy for the cult of the war dead in the Yasukuni shrine,

Murakami Shigenori states very clearly:

> It was totally effective in implanting militarism and loyalty to the emperor among the populace since the Meiji era. ---The soldiers who died for the emperor as the war dead were enshrined as Kami [Gods] and were awarded the honour of receiving the worship of the emperor, himself a Kami in human form. Thus a soldier who died for the emperor - or state - became a Kami and was enshrined in Yasukuni to be a spirit protecting the country and received eternal and warm consolation. This practice absorbed the traditional Japanese concept of the soul and was cleverly linked to militarism and worship of the emperor.[26]

Accordingly, the central significance of enshrining the dead in Yasukuni was "that the rite of enshrining is an apotheosis symbolically changing the soul's status to that of a national deity."[27] Furthermore, the special status of this shrine was assured from the fact that the emperor himself worshipped and paid tribute there to the souls of the war dead. In short, the Yasukuni cult and Tenno worship were inseparable for Japan's imperialist wars. Thus, the Yasukuni shrine received an overwhelming popular respect by enshrining the war dead of the emperor's 'holy wars'.

In the meantime, Japan's war policies expanded into other Asian countries. Alongside new shrines and the amalgamation of them in the domestic areas, in turn, the overseas shrines in almost all the occupied territories of the so-called Greater East Asia Co-Prosperity Sphere were established beginning with the Taiwan shrine that was built in 1900. Needless to say, these shrines in the colonies were constructed obviously as a symbol of the invasion and conquest. This colonial aggression was justified by the ideology of 'Hakko Ichiu' (the eight corners of the world under one roof, implying the unification of the world under the emperor). Since the Tenno was, according to State Shinto, considered to be the world's only living God, hence, just as the Ise shrine symbolized the absolute authority and power of the Tenno for the Japanese people, all subjects in the colonies "were expected to pay obedience to Japanese deities as a mark of their submission to imperial authority"[28]. As was observed, the ethnocentric ideology of Shinto was obviously embodied in these shrines, advocating the supremacy of the Japanese race.

With the rampancy of the radical militaristic patriotism in the 1930s, Japan entered into the period of so-called 'Tenno Fascism'; namely, an autocratic political-religious system (totalitarian regime) came to power.

This totalitarian regime, ultimately led Japan into a reckless military aggression and at last was completely destroyed in the Second World War. Particularly, the Japanese

military government in this period compelled Koreans and Taiwanese to worship at Shinto shrines, prohibited them from using their own languages at school and forced them to study Japanese. It was the most infamous colonial policy, that they were deprived of their identity by forcing them to take a Japanese name. All these policies of aggression were executed on the pretext of an assimilation principle, namely the propagation of 'children of the Tenno'. But as a matter of fact, they were only given second class citizenship.

As regards the domestic situation in Japan, the Peace Preservation Law of 1925, which had the central role in the system of ideological control established in the prewar period, acted to control all antigovernment political activities. Especially, thought control under the Law was so severe that any criticism of the imperial system was a serious crime. Even in academic argument it was made impossible to question it. Therefore, "most thinkers, it seems, possessed a hard core of indoctrination which instinctively drew them toward the emotional slogans tied to the emperor system."[29] Meanwhile, the Revised Peace Preservation Law of 1941 functioned tremendously well for the oppression of religious bodies, since they dissented from the national policy.

(3) The Symbolic Tenno System

The third stage, which began after Japan's defeat in 1945, is characterised by the so-called 'Symbolic Emperor System'. With Japan's defeat in the Second World War, the emperor was denied his status as a divine being. Then, immediately, a variety of reforms were carried out under the Allied Occupation in order to dismantle the prewar Japanese system of absolute imperial sovereignty. Especially the amalgamation of the Tenno system with State Shinto, which dominated the Japan's modern history, was simply dismissed with the declaration of the humanity by Emperor Hirohito and a Shinto Directive. It should be noted here that a main purpose of this reform was to dissolve all militaristic and ultra-nationalistic ideology, and to prevent shinto from exercising any compulsion in religious practice for nationalistic or militaristic purposes.

Nevertheless, at that time, the abolition of the emperor system was still in question. In short, there existed three basic views on the emperor system until the conclusion in 1948: to abolish the emperor system; to preserve and use it; and to preserve it, but suspend the emperor's power and functions.[30] Finally, partly because of a strong suggestion from the United States, by a former Japanese ambassador Joseph C. Grew, the Tenno System was to survive after all. In fact, Grew gave a famous talk, the so-called 'Queen Bee' Speech in 1944.

> To understand the position of the Emperor ---it might be useful to draw a homely parallel. As you know, the queen bee in a hive is surrounded by the attentions of the hive, which treats her with veneration and ministers in every way to her comfort---if one were to remove the queen from the swarm, the hive would disintegrate.[31]

Grew strongly believed that the imperial institution in Japan should remain. To try to abolish the Tenno System would result in chaos, and Grew stated that "the Throne, which is the cornerstone and sheet-anchor of Japanese life, can undoubtedly be used as a foundation on which to build a healthy structure in future once we have purged the country of the poison of militarism."[32]

At the same time, it should be noted that immediate post-war Japanese government persisted in trying to preserve the whole Japanese Kokutai centering the Tenno system. However, Prime Minister Shidehara Kijuro finally had to approve the GHQ draft Constitution with its two outstanding features: the symbolic emperor and the renunciation of war. Undoubtedly, in this background there were very strong suspicions and fears among countries such as China, the Philippines and Australia that if the Tenno system remained Japan might revive the militarism. Thus, Article 9 [War as a sovereign right of the nation is abolished] was incorporated into the new Constitution. It meant on the Japanese side, as Shidehara described later in his biography, that "we had to take a bold step in abandoning war and establishing a peaceful Japan in order to preserve the imperial institution and protect the national polity."[33]

Now, the principle of popular sovereignty in the new Constitution of 1947 was promulgated and the Tenno become merely a symbol[34] of national unity. The present constitution declares that:

> The emperor shall be the symbol of the State and of the unity of the people, deriving his position from the will of the people with whom resides sovereign power (Article 1) The emperor shall perform only such acts in matters of state as are provided for in this Constitution and he shall not have powers related to government (Article 4)

There is, however, a frequent argument about whether the phrases, 'deriving his position from the will of the people' (Article 1) and, "the Imperial throne shall be dynastic and succeeded to in accordance with the Imperial House Law passed by the Diet" (Article 2) contradict each other, because the 'will of the people' is rather

ambiguous there. It arouses the suspicion that Article 2 [the Imperial Throne shall be dynastic and succeeded to in accordance with the Imperial House Law] refers to something other than the principle of popular sovereignty. First of all, 'Symbol' is a very equivocal word. As a matter of fact, during the preparation for a draft of the present Constitution, the Japanese side was influenced by a definition of symbolism for the Japanese Tenno given by a prominent national statist, Satomi Kishio. He defined the Tenno as 'the highest symbol in Japanese society and state', and affirmed that "The Constitution of Japan did not establish the symbol emperor as a new category but stipulated that he already existed as a symbol. That is to say, it formally codified what had been, up to that time, an un-written category."[35] Accordingly, even if the 'symbol' was adopted into the Constitution, it was a certain fact that there were completely different interpretations about its meaning in the Western and the Japanese context. There is no doubt that the abolition of the prewar Tenno system and establishment of a new polity with a symbolic monarch clearly marked a major change, and theoretically there is no room for the Tenno to influence political matters in his legal position under the present Constitution. Nevertheless, as long as the emperor system continues to exist, even though only as a symbol, there is a great potentiality to revive the State Shinto incorporated with the Tenno System. In effect, even if many reforms have been executed in the post-war period, it cannot be denied that, at the very least, the Symbolic Tenno System facilitates the survival of nationalistic and militaristic ideologies that were dominant in the prewar Japan.

In fact, there have been persistent voices demanding the restoration of continuity with the prewar period directly after the end of the war, and authorities are always seeking a chance to exploit the Tenno, aiming to hold the seat of power, because he is still functioning to a certain extent as the centre of social sanction and nobility in the popular mind, and his symbolic influence over the Japanese people invariably impacts on the climate of the social-cultural life of Japan.

Thus, the post-war Japanese Monarchy gradually restored the reverence for the monarchy by a trend toward the popularization of the emperor around the 1960s that strengthened his position in terms of social prestige. This tendency can be described as a kind of manipulation and began to take shape gradually in the late 1960s and the 1970s and then peaked at the death of Hirohito and the enthronement of new emperor Akihito. From Hirohito's death to Akihito's succession, there were incessant campaigns for the imperial institution. The aim was to present the new emperor as the symbol of prosperity and also a symbol of unity, without the taint of war responsibility hanging over his position. The symbolic emperor system of Akihito has now performed the function of politically integrating an economically aggressive

Japan under the symbol of 'peace' and 'prosperity.'

With great wisdom, the prominent missiologist Hendrik Kraemer, had already predicted about the Tenno System in 1960:

> Under American pressure the Emperor disavowed his divinity and State Shinto was abolished. It would, however, be all too naive to think that the Emperor by this disavowal before the radio had altered anything in the hearts of the Japanese as to his real pivotal position in the Japanese 'hierarchical way'. It would also be nothing less than astonishing and un-natural (seen from inside Japan) if State Shinto or something equivalent did not creep in again. ---Yet it will be wise to reckon with the fact that Japan's spiritual core has not changed, ---Shinto will continue to enshrine the real soul of Japan.[36]

In fact, as Kraemer had seen, due partly to rapid economic growth and partly to such international events as the Tokyo Olympics in 1964 and the Osaka World Fair in 1970, there was a gradual revival of national confidence, which had been shattered by Japan's defeat in 1945. In other words, even if the symbolic emperor system does not function as a paramount power in actual fact, it does still operate through a soft ruling power of manipulation, as if subjection is generated almost spontaneously by voluntary consensus.

(4) The Yasukuni Issue: the Reviving of State Shinto

After the second world war, it may well be that one of the heaviest challenges for the Japanese has been the Yasukuni Shrine, because Yasukuni had been the most direct and conspicuous object connected with the unresolved past, and for many Japanese it symbolises what they were forced to accept in prewar times, especially what was ultra-nationalistic ideology.[37]

Immediately after Japan's defeat in the Second World War, the Allied Occupation firmly dismantled State Shinto by the 'Shinto Directive' in 1945. From then on, the Yasukuni Shrine was forced to end its official connection with the state and then was merely sanctioned as a private religious institution under the new Religious Corporations Act. In addition, Article 20, paragraph 3, of the postwar Constitution was enacted to prohibit the state from engaging in any religious activity, and Article 89 prohibits state sponsorship of any religious institution. That is to say, it is the most basic understanding in Article 20 that religious freedom and the separation of religion and state are treated as inseparable, like two sides of the same coin. Here was a painful acknowledgement that for more than 70 years the Japanese people had

been forced to sit under the oppressive situation where a single religion occupied a huge dominant position. In other words, wherever a religion executes compulsory power over the people, suppression of religion is inevitably rooted in the society. Therefore, unless separation of religion and state is guarded especially strictly, there is a great danger that freedom of religion will not be guaranteed any longer.

But in the early 1950s, the Shinto leaders started a reactionary movement for the revival of State Shinto. And in the late 1950s, as was observed in the wedding of the crown prince and the treating of the Shinto rites, "the reactionary trend of politics steadily intensified, and in the area of religion both the freedom of religion and the democratic principle of separation of government and religion were openly violated."[38]

To make matters worse, one reactionary event was the transition in US occupation policy because the Korean War broke out in 1950; that is to say, from the early policy of demilitarization "the United States now turned Japan into an advanced base in the strategy to contain communism and ordered Japan to establish the National Police Reserve (which later became 'Self-Defence Forces')."[39] Consequently, this setting-up of the self-defense forces was allowed to promote the revival movement of the Yasukuni shrine to reinstate official support for Yasukuni. In spite of the fact that the government in 1959 erected the National Tomb of the War Dead, the Japan Association for the Bereaved Families of the War Dead (1953) persisted in demanding state maintenance for Yasukuni Shrine. From 1969 on, right-wing Liberal Democratic Party Diet members, members of the Bereaved Society of Japan, and the Association of Shinto Shrines began to take action for the nationalization of Yasukuni shrine. It seems likely that the movement to restore State Shinto was reckoning upon the religious consciousness of the majority of people, who take for granted Shrine Shinto as a public religion, a non-religion or a supra-religion, as it was in prewar times. In 1967, a Liberal Democratic Party subcommittee prepared a 'Yasukuni Bill' for submission to the National Diet. The government had proposed that the Yasukuni Shrine should be once more turned into a national monument for the war dead and that it should be supported by state funds. Thus, successive LDP government tried repeatedly to pass a Yasukuni Shrine bill, but on each case opposition from the non-government groups forced them to abandon the effort. "The Christian anti-Yasukuni movement also staged strong demonstrations, hunger strikes, and expanded many nationwide campaigns. By the end of July 1969, the campaign by many religious groups for signatures on a petition opposing state administration of Yasukuni Shrine had garnered about 3.7 million names."[40] Although attempts to pass the necessary legislation through the Diet have been abandoned at last, subsequently, "new measures to win state support for the Yasukuni Shrine opened with visits to the

Shrine by prime ministers and Cabinet ministers."[41]

The official visit to the Shrine by Prime Ministers, such as Miki, Fukuda, and Nakasone, was therefore intended to be a substitute for the failed legislation. These persistent movements for reviving official Yasukuni, needless to say, were attempts to preserve the prewar nationalistic ideology (statism) and at the same time legitimize state participation through the concept that shrines are non-religious.[42] It is indeed the case that most people who want the Yasukuni Shrine to be nationalized claim at all times that a Shinto memorial service for the dead is beyond religion, simply a custom. Accordingly, they think very easily that even if the state is involved, it does not imply violation of the Constitution. Yet, in prewar days it was utterly a nightmare voice that said that "State Shinto is not a religion; for us Japanese it surpasses religion". In short, for this period of 130 years one of the most controversial and repeated issues of religion in the public life is the great contradiction between Japanese equivocal constructions of religious life and open definitions of religion, because "before 1945, the idea that Shinto was not a religion allowed it to be viewed as a supra-religious entity and its rites as obligatory civic duties."[43] There was no other more harmful logic in politics and religion than this for the Japanese society, and that, while State Shinto was "officially considered nonreligious, by the creation of a cult of the war dead Shinto nevertheless tapped Japan's oldest and most affectively laden area of religious life, the cult of the dead and the ancestors."[44] Thus Shinto systematically and craftily enticed the people into the way of Japanese ultra-nationalism and the Tenno ideology, by "idealizing as the highest good a role as the state's obedient servant"[45]and glorifying Japan's aggression. In this sense, as Helen Hardacre pointed out, it should not go unheeded in Shinto rites that the ritual discourages critical thinking and its persuasiveness is precisely because it has no contrary and hence cannot be directly challenged by rational argument.[46] Therefore, if Shinto is declared nonreligious on the ground that it lacks any doctrinal basis, and only its ritual is performed, it would evidence the dangerous and harmful tendency for closer ties between religion and state.

Hence, what are the key issues of the reviving of the Yasukuni Shrine ? There are, in short, three main problems. The first is that it would be unconstitutional for the state to support the Shrine. It would, in time, undoubtedly violate religious freedom and non-religious freedom as well. The second is the great danger of the Tenno ideology, that "the Tenno gives public morality and human value by centering on the spirits of the war dead, and then under such an ideology the danger of marked infringements upon human rights, especially freedom of conscience, is very great."[47] And the third is the ethnocentrism, because "it glorifies self-sacrifice for national interests and

neglects others, especially Asian people who were victims of the uses and abuses of nationalistic-egoistic power in and by Japan."[48]

---

[1] Kiyoko Takeda, *Ningenkan no Sokoku*[The Friction of the views of Human being], p.373.
[2] Shigenori Murakami, *Kokka Shinto to Minshu-Shukyo* [State Shinto and Popular Religion], pp.52.
[3] Alan Suggate, *Japanese Christians and Society*, p.8.
[4] "Up to now there seem to be two very distinct lines of interpretation concerning the Emperor. One line is the power-wielding Emperor---. The other is the ceremonial Emperor divorced from political power." Quoted Masanori Nakamura, *The Japanese Monarchy*, p.170.
[5] Helen Hardacre, *Shinto and The State*, p.16.
[6] Ibid, p.17.
[7] See Takeshi Fujitani, *Emperor, Nation, Pageantry*: A Historical Ethnography of Modern Japan, chapter 1.
[8] "It had three major components: the great teaching institute, a corps of national evangelists, and the three great teaching: (1) respect for the gods, love of country; (2) making clear the principles of Heaven and the way of man; (3) reverence for the Emperor and obedience to the will of the cout." Hardacre, op.cit, p.43.
[9] Karen van Wolferen, *The Enigma of Japanese Power*, p.260, p.262, and p.365.
[10] Hitoshi Abe and others, *The Government and Politics of Japan*, p.5.
[11] Quoted Richard H. Mitchell, *Censorship in Imperial Japan*, p.101.
[12] The constitution opens: "The Empire of Japan shall be reigned over and governed by a line of Emperors unbroken for ages eternal; and in Article 3 the Emperor was declared "sacred and inviolable."
[13] Bernard Eccleston, *State and Society in Post-War Japan*, p.13.
Dohi Akio, *Nihon Purotestanto Kirisutokyo-shi* [Japanese Protestant History], p.112.
[14] For example, it was promulgated below, "Our imperial ancestors have founded our empire on a basis broad and everlasting and have deeply and firmly implanted virtue; our subjects ever united in loyalty and filial piety have from generation to generation illustrated the beauty thereof. This is the glory of the fundamental character [Kokutai] of our Empire, and herein also lies the source of our education."
[15] Hardacre, op.cit, p.122.
[16] Mikio Sumiya, *Nihon Shakai to Kirisutokyo* [Japanese Society and Christianity], pp. 32-37.
[17] Wolferen, op.cit, p.282.
[18] About 'Imperial Shinto' and 'National Shinto', See Hardacre, op.cit., p.84.
[19] Murakami, op.cit, p.13.
[20] Hardacre, op.cit, p.39.
[21] Murakami, op.cit, p.16, and Hardacre, ibid., p.33.
[22] Hardacre, ibid.,p.128.
[23] Hardacre, ibid.,p.132.
[24] Yoshino Yasumaru, *Nihon Nashonarizumu no Zenya* [TheEve of Japanese Nationalism], p.250.
[25] Hardacre, op.cit, p.8.
[26] Shigenori Murakami, *Japanese Religion in the Modern Century*, p.114.
[27] Hardacre, op.cit, p.90.
[28] Hardacre, ibid, p.95.
[29] Mitchell, op.cit, p.149.

[30] Nakamura, op.cit, p.64.
[31] Quoted Nakamura, ibid, p.66.
[32] Ibid.,pp.26-27.
[33] Nakamura, ibid, p.108, Walferen, op.cit, p.325, and Suggate, op.cit, p.81.
[34] As for the bibliographical origin of the term 'symbol', See Nakamura, ibid, pp.87-106.
[35] Nakamura, ibid, p.169.
[36] Hendrik Kraemer, *World Cultures and World Religions*, pp.225-227.
[37] See Nakamura, op.cit, p.145.
[38] Murakami, op.cit, p.132.
[39] See Yoshikazu Sakamoto (edit.), *The Emperor System as a Japanese Problem.*
[40] Kumazawa Yoshinobu and David L. Swain (edit.), *Christianity in Japan 1971-90*, p.65.
[41] Kumazawa and Swain, ibid, p.69.
[42] Murakami, op.cit, p.132.
[43] Hardacre, op.cit, p.160.
[44] Ibid., p.161.
[45] Ibid., p.161.
[46] Quoted Hardacre, ibid., p.171. David Kertzer, *Ritual, Politics, and Power*, Chapter 5.
[47] Tsukada Osamu, Yasukuni Shrine and the Emperor System, in Kumazawa and Swain (edit.), op.cit, p.68.
[48] Ibid., p.67 and 74.

CHAPTER 5 TOWARDS A NEW PARADIGM OF PASTORAL THEOLOGY IN JAPAN: NEW PERSPECTIVES ON THE PASTORAL THEOLOGY

1. PASTORAL TASKS IN THE SOCIAL CONTEXT OF THE TENNO SYSTEM

So far we have considered in the previous section how politically the modern Tennno system has been invented and has developed as the axis of Japanese society. Undoubtedly, it is not merely a national political system, but the religious and political system in the Japanese social structure. Therefore a famous conservative politician, Roger Scruton surprisingly said that:

> Nevertheless, the acceptance of transcendent bonds does not require belief in transcendent beings. The Japanese, who are famous (indeed, notorious) for their willingness to accept the former, are equally remarkable for their reluctance to believe in the latter.[1]

Therefore the inquiry to be undertaken here is to discern the 'matrix of domination' that constitutes this system of attitudes, behaviors and assumptions.

(1) The Japanese Social Structure under the Tenno System

Before an inquiry into the main argument, it may be as well to consider a very illuminating story suggesting how thoroughly Tenno system effects Japanese society and the populace.

In 1976, when large-scale corruption involving a former prime minister Tanaka Kakuei and the Lockheed Corporation started to surface, a person in the management of one of the firms implicated committed suicide, leaving a note on his desk in the office that read, 'My Company is eternal'. However his words uncover how deeply this type of loyalty to one's firm is embedded in the minds of the hundreds of thousands of dedicated Japanese employees.

To put it briefly, it is hardly surprising that in this case his sad end becomes rather an admirable or at least a pitiable example for most Japanese, than a contemptible or blamable affair. Clearly, it can be said that this is a variation of the Tenno system that operates consciously or unconsciously upon the social structure in Japan.

Hence, there are briefly two main issues of the Tenno system in the social norm and structure of Japan, and these are two sides of the same coin.

(a) The Conformist Society and Its Competitive Collectivism

As we know well from the case above, it is certain that Japan is a highly conformist

society. The Tenno system does not allow a free society in which each individual can bear and perform his or her right and responsibility. Maruyama Masao, therefore, once summed it up and termed it the 'System of irresponsibilities' in his classic analysis of the Tenno system:

> An uncertain sharing of responsibility was preferred so that no person could be pointed out as bearing the ultimate responsibility for decisions. It is obvious that the mechanism of the Tenno-system state had inherent within it the danger of developing into a colossal system of irresponsibility.[2]

Why does such a thing happen? As discussed earlier, the modern Tenno system was absolutely formed by a sense of the state as a family. Thereupon, it is a very worthwhile to consider that a famous Old Testament scholar George Mendenhall stated:

> The social analogies on which the Mosaic covenant was based were political and not familial. God was conceived in terms of the Near Eastern great King, not as a Father.[3]

Yet, it is true, the family symbolism was clearly seen in the New Testament, particularly, "the life and death of Jesus provided a pattern or model for the working through of the father-son relationship with such a father as the God of Israel." And "the Church emerged as the body of those who identified with Jesus and participated in his action. ---But, as such it was a new collectivity of a different kind from that of the natural family, bound together by its hereditary connection with the patriarchs."[4] Therefore, Biblical faith is always a consequence of "shifting the locus of ultimacy from the natural social order to a transcendent reference point. (And) From the point of view of the transcendent, everything natural has only relative value and can be questioned."[5]

Undoubtedly, in Japan's modern history there is no other concept than the family state that is so strongly emphasised in the national life again and again. Particularly, the idea of family state, which assured each individual's safety and identity in the process of urbanization or modernization in the modern society, instead of 'Ie'[family or house][6] in the feudal society, it was extended into army and educational institutions like a second village and home. Consequently, Japanese society was deeply rooted in the concept of the family state throughout the country. Even now it still works in various social organisations, such as the familism of company life, and

it continues to govern large areas of Japanese consciousness and social relations.

The most vital characteristics of familism is the fact that just as the ideal condition of the family should be totally harmonious, the state has to attempt to eliminate the possibility of confrontation and conflict from society. In other words, the ideal family is intrinsically free of conflict and dissention, and the state as a macrocosm of the family should be free of disharmony likewise. Therefore, in the interactions of individuals within the state as a family, their actions are constantly expected to be performed by selfless motivation to their immediate group, and thereby to the state. In this way, in Japanese society there seems to inhere, at its deepest levels, a sense of conformity based on collectivism or strong group-centeredness. Accordingly, in this comformist society self-assertive behaviour at whatever level is usually regarded as a dangerous, disruptive or at least anti-social symptom that transgresses familism or collectivism. It may well be an incredibly ingenious device for the people who rule internally, because in spite of the fact that spontaneity and obedience essentially contradict each other, it succeeds in drawing 'spontaneous submission' from them by its logic of familism. In addition, however, there is another crucial aspect, that Japan is not merely the conformist society in which the individual simply accepts the social group into which he or she has been put as the framework for acting and living, but also it is a hierarchically controlled and goal-oriented society which has a strong motivation for competition. As a matter of course, to settle who is right in the event of difference in aims and interests between an individual and the group, there is the principle of giving primacy to group. It seems clear that behind modern Japan's development there has been not only group consciousness but strong competitive collectivism. Historically, such intense competition did not develop in Japan until after 1868, when the Meiji government tried to fulfill a kind of social mobility by abolishing hereditary social ranks and establishing a capitalist society by the hierarchy of meritocracy with loyalty to the Tenno system as a great symbolic mediator beyond all the individuals' interests.

The Tenno system, in this sense, still retains its great maintenance function for the conformist and goal-oriented society as the patriarchal head in the family state. In 1987 when Yasuhiro Nakasone stepped down as prime minister, he confessed his strong belief:

> There is a worldly, secular prime minister, but above him is the Tenno, a transcendent being who has a symbolic universal meaning. We must not forget that it is this dual structure that maintains the external authority and the domestic unity of Japan, as well as the functions of the state.[7]

In this way, the conformist mentality and the competitive collectivism in social structure are still alive today not only as a resilient historical legacy, but also as a product of the resurgence of a particularly statist orientation, big-power consciousness and neo-nationalism.

(b) The Discriminatory Society: its Ethnocentrism and its Myth of Homogeneity (based on 'Pure Blood Ideology')

There is another pathological aspect in the Japanese idea of Tenno system as the ideological framework to manipulate Japanese society, namely, the fact that the Tenno system is easily transformed into an ideology advocating the supremacy of the Japanese race and the homogeneity of Japanese society. It diffuses the illusion that Japan is purely the unitary ethnic state as a uniquely homogeneous family. Undoubtedly, these egocentric notions about Japan's state connect deeply such logic of exclusion with the notion of ethnocentrism and homogeneity based upon the pure blood ideology. In fact, those who do not belong to the Japanese pure 'blood' and the proper lineage have been excluded from Japanese society. Thus, the mythology of a pure and exclusive Japanese nation has operated powerfully as a tool for social controls to rule and maintain the social order and stability. The key to its operation is "two principles: to divide and control, and to temper relative misery by pointing to even greater misery."[8] Especially it is here that from historical circumstances there have existed two particular issues of discrimination in Japanese society, that is to say, one is the discrimination against the Korean resident (minority) by ethnocentrism, and another is the discriminated-against Buraku [*sic*](Outcast Community) by the notion of their origin or birth (family).

It is true that discrimination has been deeply rooted in Japanese culture and society, and has its origins in the pre-modern period. Especially, it should not be forgotten that such discrimination has been closely connected with some aspects of the religious-cultural background for a long time. For example, Shinto as a ceremonial cult religion has given a central significance to the notion of ritual purity, in which there is no distinction between ceremonial impurity and human immorality. On account of it, once some people had been labeled as impure, they as sinners were decisively to be expelled from the public society. In this context, Shinto has another principle, namely, 'Kegare (defilement)' which had a strong tendency to be applied to the marginalised and the socially powerless. And in addition, Shinto sensitivity in these areas was later reinforced by Buddhist prohibitions against the killing of animals. Thus, the religious sensitivity of purity and pollution found in Shinto or Buddhism, has been closely linked with the emphasis on 'blood' relations, and then

has largely defined the boundaries which separate those 'within' from the excluded 'other'. As a result of "giving the historical importance of 'blood' in defining social relations within society", there exists a high "propensity for the Japanese to discriminate against those who do not share the same 'blood' line."[9]

In the meantime, the national consciousness and identity of the Japanese in the early modern period, as we have already traced, have been formed and integrated into the Tenno System which has a patriarchal order of the family state with the emperor at the top. At the very heart of this new identity was laid the notion of the 'family state', which was the result of reviving the archaic concept of nation and citizen in accordance with racial mythology. Therefore, the national consciousness was 'racialised', and that was "dependent upon a kind of historical forgetfulness which recast the whole meaning of 'Japaneseness' in powerful images of the purity and homogeneity of the nation, the family and the Japanese way of life."[10] Very predictably, in this context there was an ideological influence from the school of National Learning for the formation of the new Japanese identity. That is to say, it had propagated the restoration of Shinto and imperial rule with its main teaching: it was necessary for the Japanese identity to return to the consciousness of ancient times before the country became 'polluted' by contact with foreign countries, and to establish the innate superiority of Japanese culture over that of China and all other nations.[11] Accordingly, it may well be that under the strong ideological influence of this National Learning the Tenno system is now reestablished, so to speak, as a tribal religion, because the Japanese idea of the Tenno as the central figure in national life expresses the sacral chief head of Japan's tribe who secures national well-being and happiness. Hence, insofar as the Tenno system is founded on the egoistic-tribal consciousness, undoubtedly it leads to the unavoidable conclusion that the Tenno system becomes a hotbed of discrimination in both the outer and the inner aspects of Japanese society.

It may be well to mention more concretely what the two main discriminations are and how they run into the stone wall of the Tenno system.

The term Buraku means simply village, but in discriminatory terms it refers to the special areas of residence of the descendants of the outcast class, whose status was imposed from their involvement in occupations such as slaughtering, tanning, and butchering, which were considered unclean by religious-cultural factors. As we have already noted, for over two centuries before Japan's modern society came into existence, the Tokugawa rulers had maintained a formal four- class system. And then in 1871 the Meiji new government issued the Outcast Emancipation Proclamation, which decreed that the residents of the buraku were henceforth to be equal to all

other citizens in status and occupation. This act, however, contained no provision whatsoever for liberating them and yet merely rearranged the discrimination in a new classification as 'Shin Heimin (new commoners)'. In short, the buraku people retained the ranking of 'outside and below' in the hierarchy of classes. Conversely, there was to be established another strong 'outside' but 'above all', the imperial household. Therefore, the clue to this problem lies in the hierarchal system of the imperial institution as family state, which is at the top of the vertical social structure, advocating the quality of the Japanese people by the pure blood ideology.
Therefore Sumie Sue, a famous author of the novel Hashi no nai Kawa [River without a bridge], has stated very explicitly:

> As long as the word 'emperor' exists in this society, the word 'buraku' will never be erased. As long as the noble status of the emperor continues, the lowly class of the buraku must exist of obvious necessity.[12]

As for the discrimination against Korean residents in Japan, needless to say, it must be traced back to the historical fact, which was "directly caused by Japanese imperialism and militarism, the fruit of the ideology of Japanese superiority, which wrecked the lives of millions of Koreans. And now they find themselves enduring exclusion and humiliation at the hands of the same race, still practising the same ideology."[13] Very evidently, under the assimilation policy following the Japan's aggression the Korean people were denied their own ethnic identity and were integrated into Japanese nationality as 'children of the Tenno', but they were never given full Japanese citizenship. They also were forced to worship at nationalistic Shinto shrines, because they were subjected to indoctrination in the State Shinto cult centered on the Tenno and were to pledge their loyalty to the Tenno. Thus, by doing so, the Tenno system became the conceptual core of Japan's marauding imperialism. Until now these same values or ideology of ethnocentrism persist deeply in various other forms within Japanese society. There are approximately 700,000 Korean residents living in Japan. About 85 percent of them are second, third or even fourth generation who were born in Japan. The great majority of them or their ancestors are individuals who moved or were forcibly brought to Japan, owing to loss of substantial livelihood under the Japan's colonial policies, such as emigration due to labor recruitment, forcible labor conscription, and other factors. It is completely understandable that most Koreans had no choice but to move to Japan. Therefore, their presence undoubtedly results from the whole political, economic and social situation in Japan's imperialism between 1911 and 1945. Nevertheless, they have

suffered from tremendous discrimination and inferior status in their everyday life in Japan, because of the prejudicial behaviour and attitudes of the Japanese majority. Hence, it is very certain, as Shunsuke Tsurumi pointed out, that through the observation of the Japanese attitude towards Korean people there can be measured the genuineness of Japanese culture and thought like a spectroscopic analysis.[14]
In this sense, what is necessary to eradicate discrimination against the Korean resident by the Japanese is a fundamental transformation of the Japanese petrified culture and society in its haughtiness and numbness which is rooted in the social structure and ethos of 'family state'.

(2) The Task of Pastoral Care in the Tenno System

An Indonesian theologian Robert Hardowirjono claimed that the main task of Asian theology is to discern both elements of liberating tradition and of oppressive tradition in the diversified religious situation of Asia. Particularly he insisted that a living theology ought to undertake the critical examination of the idolatry and the unmasking of false gods which justifies the unjust and oppressed social structure.[15]

Hence, firstly pastoral care should have its stress upon the task of discerning the integrated perspective of both individuals and society, because the Tenno system is embedded deeply within the Japanese culture and society, especially the dimension of Japanese collective unconsciousness. As many thinkers have indicated in the same way, the Tenno system has most harmfully been incorporated into the so called 'non-trancendental spiritual climate' of Japanese society.[16] In other words, since "Japanese society is the absence of a tradition of appealing to transcendental truth or universal values,"[17] "this inherent, structural identity between power and ethics was an omnipresent characteristic of the Japanese concept of the state under the emperor system."[18] Consequently, the conglomerate of the Tenno system with the state has not only irredeemably trampled on the relationship with other countries, but also has savagely twisted its own modern history.

It is especially important for pastoral care to investigate a serious human predicament within the Tenno system. With regard to this, Tsukada Osamu examined the human situation under the system as 'the confiscation of enquiry concerning ultimate matters.' He described that:

> The Tenno system arrogated to itself universal and transcendental power--- While questions about one's own personal status within the system were permissible, the imperial system itself was deemed to be beyond question or challenge since it was founded on the ultimate premise of the divinity of the emperor himself. --- [Accordingly, in the Tenno system] orders from above were blindly and

> unquestioningly followed, This confiscation (exploitation) produced obedience, technocrats, war-mongers, bureaucrats, and merchants who did not raise ultimate questions but heeded only the worldly present.[19]

Therefore, Japanese Church must be able to contribute to the awareness of a transcendental ethos that can relativise the absolutisation of earthly authorities. In this sense, an important pioneering work by a prominent Christian thinker was Yanaihara Tadao's 'Kokka no Riso [the Ideal of the State]' in which he postulates the existence of an objective spirit as a supreme principle that transcends the reality of the state and is capable of passing judgement on its actions. On the relationship between the state and justice, he says:

> Justice is an objective spirit that transcends the reality of the state while providing the foundation for its existence. In other words, rather than a principle created by the state, justice is the fundamental principle that gives rise to the state. The state does not define justice; on the contrary, justice rules the state.[20]

Another direction of Japanese Church is to create a new community based on a prophetic counter-culture. In short, the primary mark of this emerging community is solidarity with the marginalised in the society and to transcend ethnic and racial boundaries. Under the Tenno system the Japanese church and Christians in it, have very often retreated from public society to the safety of a private or personal religion, and to the security of the church as an institution. But in effect, as Tsukada also suggests, the church has a great possibility to be a new community:

> The church is an agent and channel to safeguard the freedom and worth of the individual and especially to have a self-critical solidarity with the marginalized minorities against encroachment by the state which may skillfully seek to exploit people. The church, therefore, should be 'truly the assembly of Hikokumin (Anti-national), those who have been stripped of their traditional national identity, and yet are searching for creating a new national identity as expressing the universal human community.[21]

The Japanese identity remains an unsolved problem, and cannot help but exist as a 'scarred identity' in Japan's modern history, and especially in its relationship with Asian people. In particular, it is radically challenged by the presence of the Korean minority in Japan. Therefore, the relation of an intimate relationship with the Korean

minority is the most vital and fundamental task resulting from the Japanese war responsibility which specifies the essential quality of Japanese identity.
In other words, the history of Japan's modernisation since the Meiji era has been determined by the interplay between an inferiority complex toward the West and, in compensation, a superiority complex toward the rest of Asia. It is called a 'double standard policy': one for the West and one for the rest of Asia. Overcoming this tendency is a major task on Japan's agenda. The effort toward the realisation of genuine identity will allow Japan to play a cooperative and creative role in the international society as a global village.

2. NEW DIRECTIONS OF PASTORAL THEOLOGY: UNFINISHED TASKS OF PASTORAL THEOLOGY

If it is true that "mission is an aspect of the doctrine of God and not of the doctrine of the Church" and "the *Missio Dei* is not primarily a principle for interpreting history; it is rather divine activities which makes history,"[22] first of all, then, pastoral care as practical theology has to re-examine its theory and practice as situated in the missiological context. In other words, it means activating the whole pastoral practice in the context of *Missio Dei*: God's action in this world.

Hence, first pastoral theology has dramatically to change its focus and perspective, that is, if mission is the activity of God in this world, then to interpret pastoral care exclusively in terms of care for the individual is to distort that activity to all human beings. Rather, it should be reconstructed as social/political action to participate in God's work in this world for the establishment of God's Kingdom without ignoring the interior individual dimension. That is to say, "when Christians think about the gospel and faith, they are not just thinking about having a personal spiritual experience, or even about joining a church. They must think about God ruling as King in the whole world."[23] Second, the pastoral care no longer can be considered simply as the pastor's work concentrating exclusively upon the personal problems of individuals, but instead, as corporate action toward community building by the people of God.

Thus, we can now sketch the chief outlines of Pastoral Theology in Japan.

(1) Pastoral Theology as Cultural and Social Action (Liberating praxis)

Pastoral care designated as the cure of souls has been aimed at individual pastoral service, as it were, for psychological consolation for a long time. Basically, pastoral care in Japan has had a strong inclination to neglect the social forces upon human beings, and consequently it can be said that as already discussed, it "has simply engaged in trying to adjust individuals to the social circumstances which prevail

rather than helping them to become involved in a long term and painful struggle for justice and peace."[24] Most importantly, we have to remind ourselves here that discipline can easily become a tool of social control. Particularly, this is vital for pastoral theology to locate as a liberating praxis in society. At a broad level of generalization, there is a typical prevailing presupposition that "the individual soul is the locus of salvation so individuals' conversion is the key to desirable social change."[25] A new pastoral theology must challenge such assumption, because the Kingdom of God suggests that salvation should be seen in corporate terms. Otherwise, "Some people would say that pastoral care has its own limited function. If it starts getting involved in politics and paying attention to social context, it will lose its essence and no longer do what it is good at caring for individuals."[26] However it is obvious, whether one likes it or not, pastoral work is irresponsible to reality if did not involve itself in transformation of the social and political order in which it is situated insofar as that order is oppressive and de-humanizing. In short, just as we saw with the thought of Lambourne, it means that sin must be seen in its corporate and social dimensions which has to do with the matrix of domination in oppressive and unequal social structures. In this way, in a new paradigm of pastoral theology it becomes decisively a turning point whether or not it focuses on changing individuals rather than the conditions and society which contribute to their problems. Pastoral care must become 'more socio-politically aware and committed' to take fully its role in wider society, and if it does not do so, the disadvantaged, suffering people has no option but to accept the status quo and adjust themselves to social circumstances. P. Selby precisely suggests that:

> It is worth noticing, in conclusion, that using pastoral encounters to locate people within the much larger drama of human history and the purpose of God is nothing especially new, nor is it something that has simply arisen out of recent developments in the field of pastoral care, counseling and human growth movements.[27]

Thus, therefore, it has come to be realised more and more seriously that pastoral care must get a clear social perspective so that the people can be encouraged in their struggling against an unjust society and be encouraged in their endeavours for the transformation of it. If pastoral practice is understood only to solve the individual's problem of personal adjustment to society, then K. Marx's famous critical remark can be directly applied to this situation, namely, it is merely tackling the symptom but ignoring the underlying causes; in reality, radical restructuring of the social order is

needed.[28] From this standpoint of pastoral theology, it is possible to reconstruct theology in a new way where we can take a critical solidarity with the powerless. It may be called a holistic pastoral care or a pastoral theology of cultural and social action. The new direction of pastoral practice is no longer identified simply with care for those who have been hurt by their own life and by the society around them. It aims fully to organise its function as cultural and social action. In short, "Sometimes the social structures that are causing the damage need to be challenged and changed. We must deal with the causes of evil, not just the symptoms."[29]

Undoubtedly, the involvement of the social and cultural dimension in pastoral care will be the most challenging and vital part of pastoral care in Japan.

However, if pastoral care would be altered in a new direction, what should be the most distinctive theological foundation in relating practice to God's mission? It is indeed the establishment of '*Shalom*' that all pastoral activities have to be involved with. Shalom embraces salvation, "in the sense not of deliverance from the miseries of this world into another but of wholeness and well-being and growth."[30] So it means "the realisation of the eschatological hope of justice, the humanizing of man, the socializing of humanity, peace for all creation."[31] Therefore pastoral practice can now set out the shaping of '*Shalomatising*' (Johannes C.Hoekendijk) in the public, social and political life. Hence it may well be stated that:

> This new way of being Church understands that it does not exist for itself; it is to be a sign of Christ for the world and the place where the Spirit is explicitly active. A sign does not exist for itself but for others. The Church as sign is from Christ for the world... This Church is...a Church involved in the working world and living out the meaning and joy of the resurrection in the heart of the secular world.

It is just in this missiological context of *Missio Dei* that Pastoral care must be situated and performed. .

(2) Corporate Action for Corporate Identity and Community Building

If the Christian life no longer consists in escaping from the world into a separate spiritual 'compartment', it has become clear that Pastoral Care must serve for community building in which can be brought about the encounter between Church and Society in its perspective toward the social-political context of the world. Therefore, "pastoral care is not confined to the needs of church members and would be believers. It allows for universal care through all areas of life. Christians and the church may be a focus for providing pastoral care, but meeting the needs of the world and of all people should be the aim of the church and its carers." [32] Here it seems

wise to state that we undoubtedly need to care for individuals who are important part of the pastoral task. However at this point, it is very important to emphasise that pastoral care for individual persons is ultimately for the purpose of encouraging them to serve a structure: the Kingdom of God. Certainly, it is necessary that we should not lose sight of individuals within a socio-politically informed and committed pastoral care. Yet, as we already argued again and again, there is continuously a great danger for pastoral theology to narrow its thinking and practice, and to be fallen into the trap to collude with unjust society. Hence we must keep our perspective to promote human welfare in all its aspects and its potentialities. At the same time it is necessary to notice that individual persons are not objects for giving and receiving care, but subjects for mutual caring aimed to shape and form a community.

Accordingly, in particular, pastoral practice should have the two features described below, that is, pastoral care is to be born through corporate actions relating with community building, and next, it is to focus on corporate identity rather than self-identity. It is the great lesson from African-American pastoral care.

(a) Corporate Action for Community Building

As strongly suggested in the latest ecumenical documents, Pastoral Care should be corporately undertaken by the 'universal priesthood' of all believers in which all persons have their vocation in the service of God, in the work of God's Kingdom.[33]

Considering the old model of pastoral care, first of all, it had many facets arising from Church-centredness, hierarchical way of thinking or the inner looking attitudes, that is, it was characterised by authoritarian and paternalistic model of care, and a one-to-one relationship and individualistic problem-solving approach. However, the new model should not stress such institutional consolidation dominated by the pastor and caring only for Christians, but mutual care through all the people of God, and corporate action for building a prophetic counter community, so that people can be liberated from manipulation by false powers and false idols, and can identify themselves with the disadvantaged. In this pastoral practice is revealed nothing less than the importance of the laity's role in the world. J.G. Davies precisely stated it as follows:

> When we remember that the contemporary world is one in which the fundamental functions of society are differentiated and specialized, the primary agents of the church activities in the world must be the lay members of the church in their diverse social roles and functions, with the ordained minister assisting the laity in what is essentially their engagement.[34]

(b) Corporate Identity: Japanese Identity

The conventional model of pastoral care became mainly individual welfare reflecting what God has done for me in terms of my salvation, but the new pastoral care integrates our own welfare with what God has done and is doing in the world. At this point, pastoral care should take up a proper distance and desist from the exclusive concentration upon the psychological counselling approach. For, instead of individual concern for the private area of human life, it must primarily face the central issue of corporate personality and identity, centrally who the Japanese have been and are going to be. As a matter of course, this is not to say that we ignore or are not concerned about personal growth or self-realisation. However, what is emphasised here is the simple fact that personal growth is actually realised when we, instead of primarily focusing on inner personal problems, live with responsibility for society and with concern for others, and allow personal growth to become a by-product of the engagement.

Therefore Pastoral Care in Japan is required to tackle the problem of the corporate identity: for example, How Christian Identity based on its self-transcendental ground (the person as the image of God) can contribute to overcoming the crisis of Japanese identity, which is characterised by having a sense of self-uncertainty.[35] The idea of 'corporate personality' (Wheeler Robinson) in the Jewish-Christian tradition might become a clue in the formation of new Japanese identity.

(c) The Methodology of the New Pastoral Practice in Japan

The methodological problem of the pastoral practice seems to have become an inquiry about what kind of method is the most available one for the integrating of the different realities between personal/individual sphere and social structure/intra personal sphere. More practically, it is a problem "how pastoral care such as empathy, acceptance, compassion, genuineness, consolation is exercised in social and moral context in helping encounters."[36]

Although it needs to be more fully investigated, there are briefly three methodologies of pastoral care that can be taken into an account of wider social context.

First is pastoral care as a sacramental practice, especially liturgical action which can operate on the subconscious level of human beings through using symbol and metaphor, and also can be effective on corporate action. Accordingly, this method has a great advantage for the formation of corporate identity or public lamentation, just as suggested in Psalms of the Old Testaments. Furthermore, even more specifically, the sacramental dimension is the essential element for creating and maintaining the resource of pastoral care that is concerned with the meaning of salvation and healing.

P. Selby has shown clearly, that "the assumptions behind confession are fundamentally different. They are that human weakness, failure and distress is not simply the occasion for assistance to be sought; they are occasions for worship." And "the purpose of confession and absolution is a proclamation that people leave with what they brought, but what they brought has been made an occasion of freedom (absolution) instead of an occasion of bondage."[37]

One of the most important contributions by modern Biblical theology is the new concern for narrative which constitutes a story-based world. In addition, there is a growing awareness of the interlocking reality of the inner world with the outside beyond individuals. Some social psychologist pointed out human emotion as a social construction. Here the second issue is a method of pastoral care. As observed many pastoral theologians, such as Wimbery, Capps, Gerkin, Campbell and Pattison, are commonly interested in pastoral care as a hermeneutical practice. At this point, it is the most valuable and useful thing that we can fully acquire the method engaging with both the reality of the personal inner world and the social outer world. There is a method of social psychology called 'ethnomethodology'(Harold Garfinkel). It seems to be a very powerful method which holds that when individuals may be regarded as in some ways the specific locus for suffering caused by wider social ills, we can discern how the social structure and forces affect the well-being and lives of individuals, and what the real issue which originates in the wider social and political order is. Therefore, pastoral work has a very important task to clarify how each individual or each group has been influenced by social forces, such as prejudice and stigmatisation, in particular, in the case where these social forces operate through belief, myth, and religious/cultural attitude. The ethnomethodological approach is one of the useful methods for this area, because it has a double perspective for both the psychological dimension and the sociological dimension.

Indeed, narrative pastoral theology is another powerful method for pastoral care which aims at interweaving personal life history with the so-called people's history from the underside and '*Heilsgeschichte*' (God's salvation History). In this way, pastoral care is trying to integrate the three dimensions of personal life: history, people's history and God's salvation history, into a united living human story. In this sense, it may well be said that pastoral work means crystallising these three realities into a 'dynamic-dramatic history between God and human being' (Reinhold Niebuhr) which includes the personal, and the socio-political dimension and God's History. Ultimately, people live in their own mystery, both to themselves and to those who care for them. Therefore it is true of course that "they cannot simply be understood objectively. The objective analysis and measurement of causes and effects in caring

situations can miss out badly on subjective and personal elements of great significance."[38] We must explore further this new paradigm and its method of pastoral theology in the social context of Japan.

---

[1] Roger Scruton, *The Meaning of Conservatism*, Penguin, 1980, p.171.
[2] Maruyama Masao, *Thought and Behavior in Modern Japanese Politics*, Oxford University, 1963, p.128.
[3] Quoted Robert Bellah, *Beyond Belief*, Harper & Row, p.82.
[4] Bellah, ibid.,pp.83-91.
[5] Ibid., pp.82-96.
[6] Literally means 'family' or 'house', See Alan Suggate, op.cit.,p.35 and Fukutake Tadashi, *The Japanese Social Structure*, Tokyo Univ.,p.28.
[7] Quoted Nakamura, op.cit.,p.149.
[8] Lawrance H. Thompson, *The Japan Christian Quarterly*, Summer 1976, p. 129.
[9] Michael Weiner, *Race and Migration in Imperial Japan*, Routledge, p. 8.
[10] Ibid., p.19.
It can be found a example of 'Koseki System (Family Register)' "Just as with the people of the Buraku, so too with Koreans it is an instrument of discrimination." Suggate, op.cit., p.196.
[11] Weiner, op.cit.,pp.12-13.
[12] Sumie Sue, *Hashi no nai Kawa* (River without a Bridge), vol.2., Shinchosha, p.100.
[13] Suggate, op.cit., p.202.
[14] Tsurumi Shunsuke, *Senjika Nihon no Seishin-shi* (The Spiritual History of the War-Time Japan), Iwanami, p.118.
[15] Robert Hardowirjono, in John England (edit.), *Living Theology in Asia*, Orbis, pp.148-154.
[16] Takeuchi Yoshiro, *Imi e no Kawaki* (The Thirst for Meaning), Chikuma, p.299.
[17] Wolferen, op.cit.,p.241 and 244.
[18] Maruyama Masao, 'The Logic and Psychology of Ultra Nationalism' in *Modern Japanese Politics*, Oxford Univ., p.9.
[19] Tsukada Osamu, *Shocho-Tenno-sei to Kirisuto-kyo* (The Symbolic Tenno System and Christianity), Shinkyo, p. 24.
[20] Yanaihara Tadao, *Yanaihara Tadao Zenshu* (Complete Works), vol.18, Iwanami, p.627.
[21] Tsukada, op.cit., pp.31-36.
[22] Davies, *Worship*, p.31.
[23] Amieln Osmaston and Alison White, 'Sharing our faith in the world', in Ian Bunting (edit.), *Celebrating the Anglican Way*, pp.143-144.
[24] Stephen Pattison, *A Critique of Pastoral Care*, p.91.
[25] Pattison, *A New Vision of Pastoral Care*,p.20.
[26] Pattison, op.cit, p.88.
[27] Peter Selby, *Liberating God*, p.54.
[28] Lawrence Osborn, 'Care and Change in Our Society, in Bunting(edit.), *Celebrating*, p.163.
[29] Osmaston and White, op.cit.,p.149.
[30] Davies, *Dialogue with the World*, p.13.
[31] Jürgen Moltmann, *Theology of Hope*, p.329.
[32] Stephen Pattison, *Liberation Theology and Pastoral Care*, p.217.
[33] Ibid.,p.331.
[34] Davies, *Dialogue*, p.15.
[35] Minami Hiroshi, *NihonTeki Jiga* [the Japanese Self], Kodansha, 1977.
[36] Pattison, op.cit, p.48.

[37] Peter Selby, *Liberating God*, pp.54-55.
[38] Pattison, op.cit,pp.138-139.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Abe Hitoshi and others, *The Government and Politics of Japan*, Tokyo: Tokyo University, 1994.

Abe Yoshiya, ' From Prohibition to Toleration: Japanese Government Views Regarding Christianity, 1854-73', *Japanese Journal of Religious Studies*, vol.2-3, 1978.

Amamiya Eiichi and Morioka Iwao (edit.), *Zaiseki o ninau Kyokai no Shimei* [A Mission of Church to the wartime responsibility], Tokyo: Shinkyo, 1987.

Ballard Paul H., *Foundation of Practical Theology*, Cardiff: University College, 1986.

Bellah Robert, *Beyond Belief*, New York: Harper & Row, 1970.

Boisen Anton T., *The Exploration of the Inner World*, New York: Harper & Row, 1936.

Browning Don S., *The Moral Context of Pastoral Care*, Philadelphia: The Westminster, 1976.

Browning, *Religious Ethics and Pastoral Care*, Philadelphia: Fortress,1983.

Bunting Ian (edit.), *Celebrating the Anglican Way*, London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1996.

Campbell Alastair, 'Where Have We Got To In Pastoral Studies? , *Contact* 88 (1985:3)

Campbell Alastair V. (edit.), *A Dictionary of Pastoral Care*, London: SPCK, 1987.

Campbell, *Paid to Care*, London: SPCK, 1985.

Campbell Alistair V., *Rediscovering Pastoral Care*, London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1981.

Capps Donald, *Pastoral Care and Hermeneutics*, Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984.

Capps, *Life Cycle Theory and Pastoral Care*, Philadelphia: Fortress, 1983.

Chopp Rebecca S. and Parker Duane F., *Liberation Theology and Pastoral Theology*, Decatur: Journal of Pastoral Care Publications, 1990.

Chopp, 'Practical Theology and Liberation' in Mudge Lewis S. and Poling James N. (edit.), *Formation and Reflection*, Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987.

Christian Carol (edit.), *In the Spirit of Truth*, London: Darton & Longman &Todd, 1991.

Clebsh William A. and Jaekle Charles R., *Pastoral Care in Historical Perspective*, Northvale: Jason Aronson Inc, 1975.

Clinebell Howard, *Basic Types of Pastoral Care and Counselling*, London: SCM,1984.

Clinebell Howard, ' The Challenge of the Speciality of Pastoral Counselling', *Pastoral Psychology*, 15/143 (April 1964)

Clinebell Howard, *Growth Counseling*, Nashville: Abingdon, 1979.

Cone James H., *For My People*, Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1987.

Cone, *Speaking the Truth*[ST], Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 1986.

Cone James H. and Wilmore Gayraud S. (edit.), *Black Theology*: A Documentary History, vol. two, 1980-1992, Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1993.

Cone, *Black Theology and Black Power*, New York: Seabury, 1969.

Cone, *My Soul Look Back*, Nashville: Abingdon, 1982.

Cone, *A Black Theology of Liberation*, New York: Lippincott Co, 1972.

Davies John Gordon , *Worship and Mission*, London: SCM, 1966.

Davies, *Dialogue with the World*, London: SCM, 1967.

Dohi Akio, *Nihon Purotestanto Kirisutokyo-shi* [Japanese Protestant History], Tokyo: Shinkyo, 1980.

Drummond Richard H., *A History of Christianity in Japan*, Grand Rapids, William B. Eerdmans, 1971.

Dunn James D.G. and Suggate Alan, *The Justice of God*, Carlisle: Paternoster,

1993.
Eccleston Bernard, *State and Society in Post-War Japan*, Cambridge: Polity Press, 1989.
Elison George, *Deus Destroyed:the Imageof Christianity in Early Modern Japan*□Harvard University, 1973.
England John (edit.), *Living Theology in Asia*, Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1982.
Fujitani Takeshi, *Emperor, Nation, Pageantry*: A Historical Ethnography of Modern Japan, California University, 1993.
Fukutake Tadashi, *The Japanese Social Structure*, University of Tokyo, 1982.
Furuya Yasuo, *Nihon No Shingaku* [Theology of Japan], Tokyo: Yorudansha, 1989.
Gerkin Charles V., 'The ACPE of the Seventies', ACPE News 3(2): 1, Feb. 1970 and 'Focus on the Community', ACPE News 6(2): 1, Feb. 1973.
Gerkin Charles V., *Prophetic Pastoral Practice*, Nashville: Abingdon, 1991.
Gerkin, *The Living Human Document*, Nashville: Abingdon, 1984.
Gerkin, *Widening the Horizons*, Philadelphia: The Westminster, 1986.
Germany Charles H., *Protestant Theologies in Modern Japan*, Tokyo: International Institute, 1965.
Graham Elaine L., *Transforming Practice*, London: Mowbray, 1996.
Graham Elaine and Halsey Margaret (edit.,), *Life Cycle:Women and Pastoral Care*, London: London: SPCK,1993.
Grier William H. and Cobbs Price M., *Black Rage*, New York: Basic Books, 1986.
Hardacre Helen, *Shinto and the State,1868-1988*, Princeton University, 1989.
Hardowirjono Robert, in England John (edit.), *Living Theology in Asia*, Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1982.
Hauerwas Stanley, *The Peaceable Kingdom*, Notre Dame University, 1983.
Hiltner Seward, *Pastoral Counseling*, Nashville: Abingdon, 1949.
Hiltner, *Preface to Pastoral Theology*, Nashville: Abingdon, 1958.
Hiltner, 'Judgment and Appraisal in Pastoral Care', *Pastoral Psychology*, 16/159 (1965)
Hiltner Seward, 'Association of Pastoral Counselors: A Critique', *Pastoral Psychology*, 15/143(April 1964)
Hiltner, 'Theology and Pastoral Care in the United States', *Pastoral Psychology*, November 1967.
Hoekendijk, J. C., *The Church Inside Out*, Philadelphia: The Westminster, 1966.
Holifield E. Brooks, *A History of Pastoral Care in America*, Nashville: Abingdon, 1983.
Hopkins Dwight N., *Black Theology UAS and South Africa*, Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1989.
Hori Ichiro(edit.), *Nihon no Shukyo* [Japanese Religion], Tokyo: Taimei-do, 1985.
Hori Ichiro (edit.), *Japanese Religion*, Tokyo: Kohdansha, 1972.
Hulme William E., 'Concern for Corporate Structures or Care for the Individual?' *The Journal of Pastoral Care*, vol.23, 1969.
Hunter Rodney J. (edit.), *Dictionary Pastoral Care and Counseling*, Nashville: Abingdon, 1990.
Hurding Roger, *Roots and Shoots*, London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1985.
Iglehart Charles W., *A Century of Protestant Christianity in Japan*, Tokyo: Charles E. Tuttle, 1959.
Johnson Paul E., *Personality and Religion*, Nashville: Abingdon, 1957.
Johnson Paul E., *Person and Counselor*, Nashville: Abingdon, 1967.
Kegley Charles W. and Bretall Robert W. (edit.), *Reinhold Niebuhr*: his religious, social, and political thought, London: Macmillan, 1956.
Kertzer David, *Ritual, Politics, and Power*, New Haven: Yale University, 1988.

Kraemer Hendrik, *World Cultures and World Religions*, London: Lutterworth, 1960.
Kudo Eiichi, *Kirisutokyo to Buraku Mondai*, Tokyo: Shinkyo, 1983.
Kumazawa Yoshinobu and David L. Swain (edit.), *Christianity in Japan 1971-90*, Tokyo: Kyobunkan, 1991.
Lake Frank, *Clinical Theology*[CT], London: Darton Longman & Todd, 1966.
Lake, *Tight Corners in Pastoral Counselling*, London: Darton Longman & Todd, 1981.
Lake Frank (Abridged by Martin H. Yeomans), *Clinical Theology*, London: Darton Longman & Todd, 1986.
Lambourne Robert, 'Treasure in a Large Earthen Vessel' in Michael Wilson (edit.), *Exploration in Health and Salvation*, University of Birmingham, 1983.
Lambourne Robert A., *Community, Church and Healing*, London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1963.
Lambourne Robert, `With Love to the USA' in Melinsky M. A. H. (edit.), *Religion and Medicine*, London: SCM, 1970.
Lambourne R.A., 'Personal Reformation and Political Formation in Pastoral Care', *Contact* 44, Spring 1974. and *Contact* 88, 1985:3.
Landon H. R. (edit.), *Reinhold Niebuhr*: A Prophetic Voice in Our Time, New York: Seabury, 1962.
Lartey Emmanuel, *Pastoral Counselling in Inter-Cultural Perspective*, Bern: Peter Lang, 1987.
Lartey, *In Living Colour*, London: Cassell, 1997.
Lattimore Vergel, 'The Positive Contribution of Black Cultural Values to Pastoral Counseling', *The Journal of Pastoral Care*, 1982, vol.36.
Lee Robert, *Stranger in the land: A Study of the Church in Japan*, London: Lutterworth, 1967.
McNeill, J. T., *A History of the Cure of Souls*, New York: Harper & Row, 1951.
Maruyama Masao, 'The Logic and Psychology of Ultra Nationalism' in *Thought and Behavior in Modern Japanese Politics*, Oxford University, 1963.
Marteau Louis, 'A Short History of Pastoral Care and Counselling in Great Britain and Its Present Challenge,' *The Journal of Pastoral Care*, vol.27. No.2, June 1973.
Melinsky Hugh (edit.), *Religion and Medicine*, London: SCM, 1970.
Minami Hiroshi, *NihonTeki Jiga* [the Japanese Self], Tokyo: Iwanami, 1982.
Mitchell Richard H., *Censorship in Imperial Japan*, Princeton: Princeton University, 1983.
Moltmann Jürgen, *Theology of Hope*, London: SCM, 1967.
Moriyama Gunjiro, *Minshuhoki to Matsuri*, Tokyo: Chikuma-shobo, 1977.
Mudge Lewis S. and Poling James N. (edit.), *Formation and Reflection*, Philadelphia: Fortress, 1987.
Murakami Shigenori, *Japanese Religion in the Modern Century*, Tokyo: Tokyo University, 1980.
Murakami Shigenori, *Kokka Shinto to Minshu-Shukyo* [State Shinto and Popular Religion], Tokyo: Yoshikawa Kobundo, 1982.
Nakamura Masanori, *The Japanese Monarchy*, Armonk and London: M. E. Sharpe, 1992.
Nakazawa Koki, *Brunner and Japan*, Tokyo: Yamamoto, 1978.
Niebuhr Reinhold, *Faith and History*, New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1949.
Niebuhr, *Man's Nature and His Communities*, New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1965.
Niebuhr, *The Self and Dramas of History*, New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1955.

Niebuhr R., 'Reply to Interpretation and Criticism' in Kegley Charles W. and Bretall Robert W. (edit.), *The Theology of Paul Tillich*, London: Macmillan, 1952.
Nishigaki Tsyugikazu, 'East Asian Pastoral Care Movement' in Hunter Rodney J. (edit.), *Dictionary of Pastoral Care and Counseling*, Nashville: Abingdon, 1990.
Nouwen Henri, *The Wounded Healer*, New York: Doubleday, 1972.
Oates Wayne, *The Christian Pastor*, Philadelphia: The Westminster, 1964(Revised.)
Oden Thomas, *Care of Souls in the Classic Tradition*, Philadelphia: Fortress, 1984.
Oden, *Pastoral Theology*, New York: Harper & Row, 1983.
Osborn Lawrence, 'Care and Change in Our Society, in Bunting(edit.), *Celebrating the Anglican Way*, London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1996.
Osmaston Amieln and White Alison, 'Sharing our faith in the world', in Ian Bunting (edit.), *Celebrating the Anglican Way*, London: Hodder & Stoughton, 1996.
Pastoral Care and the Training of Ministers, The British Council of Churches, 1969.
'Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World' (*Graudium et Spes*),
Pannenberg Wolfhart, *Christian Spirituality and Sacramental Community*, London: Darton, Longman & Todd, 1984.
Pattison Stephen, *A Critique of Pastoral Care*, London: SCM, 1988 and 1994(2nd)
Pattison Stephen with Woodward James, *A Vision of Pastoral Theology* (A Contact Pastoral Monograph), Edinburgh: Contact pastoral Trust, 1994.
Pattison, *Liberation Theology and Pastoral Care*, Cambridge University, 1994.
Peters John, *Frank Lake*, London: Darton Longman & Todd, 1989.
Pierce Charles M., 'Psychiatric Problems of the Black Minority', in S. Arieti (edit.), *American Handbook of Psychiatry*, New York: Basic Books, 1974.
Poling James Newton, The Abuse of Power, Nashville: Abingdon, 1991.
Poling, *Deliver Us From Evil*, Philadelphia: Fortress, 1996.
Poling, 'Race, Gender and Class in Practical Theology,' *Contact* 120, 1996
Pouissant Alvin F., *Why Blacks Kill Blacks*, New York: Emerson Hall, 1973.
Powell Robert C., *CPE-50 Years Learning Through Supervised Encounter With Living Human Documents*, Decatur: The Association for Clinical Pastoral Education, 1976.
Reischauer Edwin O., *Japan: the Story of a Nation*, Tokyo: Charles E. Tuttle, 1970.
Reischauer and Craig Alberta M., Japan: *Tradition and Transformation*, Tokyo: Charles E. Tuttle, 1978.
Rieff Philip, *The Triumph of the Therapeutic*, New York: Harper & Row, 1966.
Rogers Carl R., *On Becoming a Person*, New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1961.
Rogers, Client-Centered Therapy, New York: Houghton Mifflin, 1966.
Ross Alistair, *An Evaluation of Clinical Theology*, CTA Association, 1994.
Sakamoto Yoshikazu (edit.), *The Emperor System as a Japanese Problem*, Tokyo: International Peace Research, 1990.
Selby Peter, *Liberating God*, London: SPCK, 1983.
Scruton Roger, *The Meaning of Conservatism*, Harmondsworth: Penguin, 1980.
Sumie Sue, *Hashi no nai Kawa* (River without a Bridge), vol. 2., Tokyo: Shinchosha, 1961.
Sumiya Mikio, *Kindai Nihon no Keisei to Kirisutokyo*, Tokyo: Shinkyo, 1961 and 1971(7th)
Sumiya Mikio, *Nihon Shakai to Kirisutokyo* [Japanese Society and Christianity], Tokyo University, 1954 and 1968(8th)
Suggate Alan, *Japanese Christians and Society*, Bern: Peter Lang, 1996.
Takeda Kiyoko, *Ningenkan no Sokoku* [The Friction of the views of Human being],

Tokyo: Kohbundo, 1959 and 1967(Revised.)
Takeda Kiyoko, *Haikyosha no Keifu* [The Genealogy of Apostasy], Tokyo: Iwanami, 1973.
Takeuchi Yoshiro, *Imi e no Kawaki* (The Thirst for Meaning), Tokyo: Chikuma, 1988.
Tamashiro Tetsu *Mizu-Shakai no Kozo*, Tokyo: Ronsosha, 1979.
Tamashiro, *Mizuno Shiso*, Tokyo: Ronsosha, 1983.
Thompson Lawrance H., *The Japan Christian Quarterly*, Summer, 1976.
Thornton Edward E., *Professional Education for Ministry*, Nashville: Abingdon, 1970.
Thurneysen Edward, *A Theology of Pastoral Care*, Richmond: John Knox, 1962.
Tillich Paul, *The Shaking of the Foundation*, New York: Charles Scribner's Sons, 1948.
Tillich, *The Courage to Be*, New Haven: Yale University, 1952.
Tillich P., 'Sin and Grace in the Theology of R. Niebuhr' in Landon H. R. (edit.), *Reinhold Niebuhr*: A Prophetic Voice in Our Time, New York: Seabury, 1962.
Togshik Ryu, *Kankoku no Kirisutokyo*, Tokyo University, 1987.
Torres Sergio and Eagleson John (edit.), *Theology in the Americas*, Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1976.
Tsukada Osamu, *CTC Bulletin*, 3/3, December 1982.
Tsukada Osamu, 'Yasukuni Shrine and the Emperor System', in Kumazawa and Swain (edit.), *Christianity in Japan 1971-90*, Tokyo: Kyobunkan, 1991.
Tsukada Osamu, *Shocho-Tenno-sei to Kirisuto-kyo* (The Symbolic Tenno System and Christianity), Tokyo: Shinkyo, 1990.
Tsurumi Shunsuke, *Senjika Nihon no Seishin-shi* (The Spiritual History of the War-Time Japan), Tokyo: Iwanami, 1991.
Unuma Hiroko, *Nihon Kirisutokyo-shi*, Tokyo: Seigakuin, 1992.
Urakawa Kazusaburo, ' Uragami Kirishitan□shi' in *Nihon Kirisutokyo-shi*, Tokyo: Seigakuin, 1992.
Van Wolferen Karen, *The Enigma of Japanese Power*, New York: Macmillan, 1989
Washington James M., *A Testament of Hope*: The Essential Writing of Martin Luther King, JR., New York: Harper & Row, 1986.
Weatherhead Leslie D., *Psychology, Religion and Healing*, London: Hodder and Stoughton, 1951.
Weiner Michael, *Race and Migration in Imperial Japan*, London and New York: Routledge, 1994.
Westerhoff John H., *Will our children have faith?* , New York: Seabury Press, 1976.
Wicks, R. J., Parsons Richard D., and Capps, D. E. (edit.), *Clinical Handbook of Pastoral Counselling*, New York and Mahwah: Paulist, 1985.
Wilmore Gayraud S., 'Pastoral Ministry in the Origin and Development of Black Theology' in Cone and Wilmore (edit.), *Black Theology*, Maryknoll, NY: Orbis, 1993.
Wilson Meretle H. and Lyles Michael R., 'Interracial Pastoral Counseling with Black Clients,' *The Journal of Pastoral Care*, 1984, vol.38: No 2.
Wilson Michael (edit.), *Exploration in Health and Salvation*, University of Birmingham, 1983.
Wimberly Edward P., 'Pastoral Counseling and the Black Perspective', *The Journal of Pastoral Care*, 1976,vol.30: No.4.
Wimberly Edward P., 'Minorities' in Wicks Robert J., Parsons Richard D., and Capps Donald E (edit.), *Clinical Handbook of Pastoral Counseling*, New York and Mahwah: Paulist, 1985.
Wise Carrol, *Pastoral Counseling*, New York: Harper & Row, 1951.

Yanaihara Tadao, *Yanaihara Tadao Zenshu* (Complete Works), vol.18, Tokyo: Iwanami, 1963.
Yoshino Yasumaru, *Nihon Nashonarizumu no Zenya* [The Eve of Japanese Nationalism], Tokyo: Asahi, 1977.